

The Review of English Studies

VOL. IV.—No. 13.

JANUARY 1928.

ABRAHAM COWLEY AS DRAMATIST

BY ARTHUR H. NETHERCOT

ABRAHAM COWLEY, best known to most readers to-day as an essayist and a "metaphysical" poet, was also the author, or part-author, of five plays—or, more exactly, of three complete plays (*Love's Riddle*, *Naufragium Jocularis*, and *The Guardian*), one revision (*Cutter of Coleman-Street*, a much improved version of *The Guardian* and also the author's only contribution to the professional stage), and one doubtful collaboration (Buckingham's *The Rehearsal*). Essentially, then, Cowley belongs to the tradition of the academic drama, in his day drawing to a close; and his work is chiefly interesting for this reason. Moreover, when judging it, one must remember that all his undoubted plays were first written while he was either in preparatory school or in college, and that his only dramatic composition of any general importance did not appear until his middle age.

I. LOVE'S RIDDLE: A PASTORAL COMEDY

Westminster School, which Cowley probably entered in his tenth or eleventh year (1628 or 1629), although never the home of any semi-professional company of child actors as were Paul's and the Chapel Royal, still had an honourable history in the drama.* Udall died as its head master, and his successors, such as John Taylor and William Elderton, retained his interests; their boys therefore continued to give occasional amateur performances, though the heyday of the school drama had passed before Cowley's time.

* See J. T. Murray, *English Dramatic Companies* (London, 1910), i. 340-341; ii. 168-170; and E. K. Chambers, *The Elizabethan Stage* (Oxford, 1923), ii. 69-73.

Cowley's early interest in the stage may be traced through various references in his first play and in his juvenile poems published while he was still at Westminster.*

Although the interest in plays at this school during Cowley's stay there was apparently not merely theoretical (compare the reference in the dedication of *Love's Riddle* to a "part for Robinson, whom they At Schoole, account essentiall to a Play"), the first proof of the precocious boy's attraction to the drama beyond that of an ordinary reader or spectator did not appear until more than two years after he had gone up to Trinity College, Cambridge, in 1636.† The title-page of "*Loves Riddle. A Pastorall Comaedic; Written At the time of his being Kings Scholler in Westminster Schoole*" shows, however, that his dramatic activity had begun when he was eighteen years old at the most (and Gosse guesses "about . . . sixteen" ‡). That Cowley and his friends recognised this deficiency in age is clear from the modestly apologetic dedication, with its references to time "stolne . . . from Cat, or Ball," and from the line in the epilog, "'twas a Boy made the Play." *Love's Riddle* seems never to have been acted.

Although most of the early literary historians, such as Giles Jacob (1719) and David Baker (1764), had praised Cowley for his absolute originality in this play as well as in all his others, § Greg is probably right in maintaining that the chief merit of *Love's Riddle* lies in "the more or less clever manner in which borrowing, reminiscence, and tradition were interwoven and combined," || even more than in the additional evidence that it offers of Cowley's precocity. ¶ The boy had obviously impregnated himself in the reading of pastorals of all types, so that a complete tracing of the conventions to their sources is almost impossible, if desirable.

* Cf. the phrase "prologue to his tragedy" (*Constantius and Philetus*); the satirical anecdote, "A Poetical Revenge"; and several references in *Love's Riddle* (Grosart ed. of Cowley, Edinburgh, 1881), III. i. 73-75, and 478-481; IV. i. 510-512.

† The play is dated 1638 on the title-page. However, since it is usually found bound up with *Naufragium Jocularis*, which bears the same date and the name of the same publisher, and since the latter play describes itself as being given on the "4^o Nonas Feb. An. Dom. 1638," both plays probably appeared early in 1639 according to our present calendar. Cf. G. C. Moore Smith, *College Plays Performed in the University of Cambridge* (Cambridge, 1923), p. 90.

‡ Edmund Gosse, "Abraham Cowley," *Seventeenth Century Studies* (N. Y., 1897), p. 200.

§ Jacob, *The Poetical Register* . . . (London, 1719), pp. 49-50; [Baker], *The Companion to the Playhouse* (London, 1764), i. n.p. (under title of play).

|| W. W. Greg, *Pastoral Poetry and Pastoral Drama* (London, 1906), p. 362.

¶ Cf. also Grosart, i. xiv., xlv. ff.

Certain influences, however, are more apparent than others. Gosse, writing first in 1876, thought that Cowley's choice of Cambridge and Trinity must have been shaped partly by his desire to associate with Thomas Randolph, whose plays and poems had been making the college famous since the beginning of the decade.* But though Gosse consequently wrote, "This boyish drama is one of the most readable things that Cowley ever executed, and is in distinct following, without imitation, of Randolph's *Jealous Lovers*," † his enthusiasm exceeded his judgment (as is too often the case when critics with too wide interests are "discovering" neglected "minor" writers), for, as Greg finally pointed out, there is almost nothing of *The Jealous Lovers* in *Love's Riddle*, though probably a considerable amount of Randolph's *Amyntas*, which, albeit unpublished, had been performed at Whitehall before Cowley wrote his play.‡

Although the two possible links which Greg had noted between *The Jealous Lovers* and *Love's Riddle* (the parallel lecherous old hags, Dipsa and Truga; and the incidental hits at astrology in v. ii. of the former and III. i. of the latter) may be supplemented by two or three others (the dedication of both to the brilliant but erratic favourite of Prince Charles, Sir Kenelm Digby; lovers' abuse of one another; and a parent's discovery of his lost children at the end of both plays), these are hardly sufficient to turn a Roman intrigue play into a pastoral comedy, such as *Amyntas*. In this comparison, too, Greg's list of parallels (the madness of Cowley's Aphron compared to that of Randolph's *Amyntas*; the speech of Cowley's Florellus in III. i., recalling the return of Corymbus and Claius in *Amyntas*; the location of the scene in Sicily; and the similar functions of Truga and Dorylas) may be supplemented: Randolph's Laurinda plays Damon and Alexis against each other much as Cowley's Callidora uses Hylace and Bellula; in Randolph a father, Claius, returns, and in Cowley, a brother; the first speeches of both madmen allude to Tisiphone and Erynnis; Alupis in Cowley, III. i., plagues a shepherdess by his method of delivering news much as does Dorylas in Randolph, I. i.—in fact, both are the conventional

* Gosse, p. 198.

† *Ibid.*, p. 201.

‡ Greg, pp. 364-365; also Homer Smith, "Pastoral Influence in the English Drama," *P.M.L.A.*, xii. (1897), 444.—Moreover, Randolph had not only left Cambridge before Cowley arrived, but had died in 1635 (contrast Gosse's implication above).

witty, knavish lads ; and Cowley, III. i., refers to an Amaryllis—the name of one of Randolph's shepherdesses—as a paragon of beauty. But even these passages do not prove any great indebtedness ; indeed, the resemblances might be purely accidental.

The palm, however, is certainly Randolph's. Though Cowley manages his plot better than the very episodic one of his rival, Randolph has created a much more consistent classical pastoral atmosphere. Cowley's confusion of the true pastoral and the sylvan is shown by the conventional prayer of Callidora to the "Sylvan Deities" at the end of Act I. Cowley has also marred his play with contemporary English allusions. His deities are pagan enough in name, but oaths by Pan, Jove, and so on do not accord well with references to "pritty Mistris *Maukin*," to the "City Beare-Garden," to rising between the acts at the theatre, to the "fearfull noyse of Guns," and to "a Welchman" ; nor would one expect even a mad Sicilian to exclaim "Pox on you" ! Similarly, Cowley's youth and his juvenile fondness for conceits have, in spite of many remarkably good passages, prevented him from achieving such a unified piece of poetry as *Amyntas*.

Seldom does Cowley rise to any genuine "metaphysical" lines, except in Callidora's short speech in Act I. beginning—

For as the soule is nobler then the body
So its corruption askes a better medicine.

Ordinarily, however, his conceits, which are most plentiful in the first half of the play, are fairly commonplace, as in describing a lover as part chameleon and part salamander, in praying the sun of love to melt the ice of a woman's heart, and in supposing nature to have "robbed the Great to make one Microcosme," *i.e.* one woman. In versification, finally, Randolph's play is more pleasing, for Cowley's discloses the same tendencies for which later critics attacked his poetry, although he himself maintained that the fault was in their scansion : that is, his lines often seem to lack the requisite number of feet or to possess more than desirable for the smoothest reading ; and sometimes they break off unfinished at the end or in the middle of speeches.

As a matter of fact, there is little in Randolph that Cowley could not have got as well from the older and more famous romances of both the Continent and England.* Because of the title of Tasso's

* Cf. H. Smith, pp. 443, 448, who adds Theocritus and Virgil.

Aminta one might expect to find something of it in the two English authors, but in reality Guarini's *Il Pastor Fido*, much more popular in England, seems to have been more influential. Its complex plot, with its pairing-off of characters and its use of confidantes, is much closer to the intricacy of *Love's Riddle* than is the simplicity of *Aminta*. The long-lost child theme, which of course might derive from Terence or Plautus, also appears in both. Truga, according to Marks, "is but Guarini's Corisca." * (Guarini's dramatic pastoral had been translated into English in 1602.†) Greg suggests that the discovery of Bellula's identity resembles that of Chloe in Longus's *Daphnis and Chloe* (third century), or perhaps recalls Bonarelli's *Filli di Sciro* (1607),‡ which had been adapted as *Scyros* by Dr. Samuel Brooke of Trinity in 1612-1613.§

As for the native sources that Cowley had probably assimilated, Greg gives a good list.|| He suggests that Callidora, loved in the disguise of a young man by two girls, recalls Daniel's Silvia as well as Rosalind courted by Phoebe; that Callidora's unwilling engagement in a duel with her unsuspected brother Florellus is obviously reminiscent of Viola's affair in *Twelfth Night*; that the chivalric element owes much to the Arcadia; and that the three-cornered love scene (III. v.), in Joseph Rutter's *The Shepherds' Holiday* (1635) "may possibly have suggested to Cowley the best scene" in *Love's Riddle* (IV. i., which gives the play its title),|| inasmuch as both present one character repeating to a second the words of rejection which a third has used to him. He might also have added that Rutter's *The Shepherds' Holiday* (1635) was not only dedicated to Sir Kenelm Digby, like Cowley's and Randolph's plays, but was even accompanied with an elegy on Digby's dead wife; that Phoebe and Sylvius of *As You Like It* are likewise in the background of Hylace's flouting of Palaemon; that Bellula, brought up in the comparatively rude environment of sheep-tending, keeps uncontaminated all the "virtue" of her unknown noble race, just as did Perdita of *The*

* Jeannette Marks, *English Pastoral Drama* (London, 1908), p. 87. Cf. also Josephine Laidler, "A History of Pastoral Drama in England until 1700," *Englische Studien*, xxxv. (1905), 237, who sees even more of Spenser's foulest hags than of Corisca.

† Greg, p. 242.

‡ *Ibid.*, p. 365. John Oldmixon, freely translating Bouhours in *The Arts of Logick and Rhetorick* . . . (London, 1728), had also detected a stylistic similarity between Bonarelli and Cowley (p. 228).

§ See Moore Smith, pp. 5-6.

|| Greg, pp. 365, 361.

Winter's Tale, and is rewarded with the love of the young aristocrat Florellus; that Lyly may have had a finger in the forming of Alupis, who is as much the witty page as he is the Vice of the moralities or the intriguing servant of classical comedy; and that Lyly's *Gallathea* may also have suggested the idea of making the shepherdesses fall in love with one of their own sex, disguised as a youth. An allusion to Ben Jonson (whom Cowley admired greatly *) and his characterisation may be seen in Aphron's statement in Act III. that he "came here to be a mad-man" and in Alupis's acknowledgment that he likes the "humour" of Aphron mightily. Finally, two of the favourite themes of pastoral poetry recur frequently in *Love's Riddle* as well as in other plays by the same author. The first is that of love, which appears in different forms, both in eulogies and in "cooling cards" dissuading from the passion, somewhat in the manner of Lyly, though Cowley never toys pruriently with the praise of virginity as did his predecessors, Fletcher and Randolph. The second is that of the comparative value of city and country life, which is introduced early in the first acts and occurs several times, notably in the "Beatus ille" or "How happy is that man . . ." passage in Act II. Other lyric elements, especially in the form of songs for boy-singing, are prominent.

Although the play had no stage history, it did not drop entirely out of sight after its author's death in 1667. Peculiarly enough, Sprat failed to mention any of his friend's plays in his biography published with the 1668 edition of Cowley's works, but this failure may perhaps be balanced by Dr. Henry Felton's sweeping assertion in 1713 that Cowley "was beloved by every Muse he courted, and hath rivalled the *Greek and Latin Poets* in every Kind, but Tragedy."† Gerard Langbaine listed *Love's Riddle* approvingly in his *Momus Triumphans* (1688) and *An Account of the English Dramatick Poets* (1691),‡ Anthony à Wood did the same in his *Fasti Oxonienses* (1692),§ and Jacob followed them in his *Poetical Register*, before cited.

The nearest approach to a stage production of the play occurred in 1723, when Daniel Bellamy, brother of the mistress of a girls' boarding school, outraged the helpless Cowley by adapting *Love's*

* See Grosart's ed., i. 189, 215, 225.

† Felton, *A Dissertation on Reading the Classics* . . . (London, 1723), p. 31.

‡ Langbaine, *Momus Triumphans* . . . (London, 1688), p. 4; *Account* . . . (Oxford, 1691), p. 82.

§ À Wood, *Fasti, in Athenae Oxonienses* (London, 1813-20), iv. 209 ff.

Riddle for their innocent minds as *The Rival Nymphs*, with the following prolog :

The Scenes to night for your Diversion chose
Were drawn by the Great Cowley's Infant-Muse :
His Muse Our Master hopes will hit your Taste ;
Because she's Chearful, and yet strictly Chast.
He fears his Alteration of her play
Has done her Wrong, and made her Charms decay.
Some Scenes he found too hard, and all too long
For Us, so unexperienc'd, and so young.
Yet still he hopes, thro' his Disguise, she'll shine,
And prove Agreeable, if not so Fine.*

In this version the names are changed, but the characters are almost the same. The new play is mostly in prose. In the same volume Bellamy translated the first three scenes of Guarini's *Il Pastor Fido*.

Cowley's title may have suggested that of Colley Cibber's *Love in a Riddle* (1729).† [Theophilus] Cibber's *The Lives of the Poets of Great Britain and Ireland* (1753) eulogised *Love's Riddle* along with all of its author's works,‡ as did both the 1750 and the 1789 editions of the *Biographia Britannica*.§ David Baker's opinion has already been given, though in another place he stated that Cowley's dramas "are those of all his Writings the least esteem'd."|| Dr. Johnson had a similar feeling, for he wrote (1779) that "this comedy is of the pastoral kind, which requires no acquaintance with the living world, and therefore the time at which it was composed adds little to the wonders of Cowley's minority."¶ The *New and General Biographical Dictionary* (1784) was a little more charitable,** whereas the writer of Cowley's life in Robert Anderson's *A Complete Edition of the Poets of Great Britain* (1792) cited *Love's Riddle* as one proof of its author's "vernal maturity."†† The *Retrospective Review* (1827) admitted it a "green production"; but noted that it aimed

* Marks, p. 86, compares the two plays, praising Cowley's "astonishing maturity, . . . poetic gift and inventive faculty," and ridiculing Bellamy as a "poor poetaster."

† Cf. Marks, p. 86.

‡ Cibber, *Lives of the Poets* . . . (London, 1753), ii. 42 ff.

§ "Cowley," *Biographia Britannica* (London, 1748 ff., and 1778-1793).

|| Baker, under "Cowley," n.p. The same passage is repeated in the 1782 and 1812 eds. of the *Biographia Dramatica*.

¶ Johnson, *The Lives of the English Poets* (Oxford, 1905), i. 4.

** Owen and Johnston, *A New and General Biographical Dictionary* (London, 1784), iv. 165 ff.

†† "Cowley," *A Complete Edition of the Poets of Great Britain* (London, 1792-1807), v. 202-203.

at "some discrimination of character" and was "supported with more than juvenile equality of merit." *

The opinions of the most important modern critics have already been referred to, with the exception of two early writers on the pastoral, Josephine Laidler, who praised the play more highly than the *Amyntas*,† and Homer Smith, who thought that it "loses nothing in comparison with other pastoral dramas," ‡ and of Schelling, who asserts that it, "judged with its kind, stands in no need of any allowance for the author's youth." §

An unbiased student will not take an extreme position on either side. On the whole, Cowley's first play must be considered only as an unusual juvenile performance—and the merry chase which it has led its critics for sources would, if justified, prove the prodigiousness of the boy's reading at an age when most youths have sufficient to do to master their assigned lessons. *Love's Riddle* may possess a typical Cowleyan humour and a clever vein of satire, but it is emphatically lacking in the grace and interest of the best exemplars of its genre, such as Fletcher's *The Faithful Shepherdess*.

II. NAUFRAGIUM JOCULARE: A LATIN UNIVERSITY PLAY

The college to which young Abraham Cowley carried the manuscript of *Love's Riddle* boasted the most illustrious theatrical history of all the schools in Great Britain. According to statistics compiled by F. S. Boas and G. C. Moore Smith, plays were performed at Trinity seventy-two times between 1482 and 1747, the extreme dates covered by the Cambridge records, whereas during the same period only two hundred and twenty-five performances were given in the entire University.|| Moreover, after 1620, "Trinity and Queens' seem to have been the only colleges left in which plays were still performed with distinction" and "when the Restoration came, . . . Trinity College alone seems to have set itself to rival or eclipse the theatrical triumphs of the past. . . ." ¶

The extant records, accounts, etc., bring up a remarkably vivid picture of the amateur theatricals of Cowley's college. It is not

* *Retrospective Review*, 2nd Series, i. 376.

† Laidler, pp. 237-238.

‡ Homer Smith, p. 443.

§ F. E. Schelling, *Elizabethan Drama* (Boston and N. Y., 1908), ii. 176.

|| Boas, *University Drama in the Tudor Age* (Oxford, 1914), pp. 386-390; Moore Smith, pp. 50-72.

¶ Moore Smith, pp. 10, 14-15.

certain whether the "Comedy House" (for the day of academic tragedy had vanished) which it built for itself near the back of the Master's Lodge was put up before or after the Commonwealth, but it is known that its rival, Queens', erected its playhouse in 1638-39.* From documents of the periods just before and just after Cowley's time, one learns that the school paid sums varying from a few shillings to a couple of pounds for constructing necessary properties; that the "University Musick" was sometimes hired to play; that admission was sometimes by tickets made of wax; and that the hall was lighted with tallow or wax candles in iron candlesticks, with pitch in cressets, with torches, links, and lanthorns. Placards were still hung up on the stage to indicate the setting. Performances averaged five or six hours in length (clearly, these were amateur companies!), and began at any time from just before noon to the early evening, depending often on the pleasure and convenience of many noble and royal visitors, who came from the Palatinate and from Tuscany as well as from London, and were as frequently bored by the performances as not. Refreshments were served afterwards to put the audience in good humour—wine, burnt claret, canary, diet bread, or oranges. The actors, however, were rewarded with something more substantial—puddings, cheese, ale, loins and breasts of mutton, beer, bread and butter, canary, claret, pipes and tobacco. Inasmuch as riots with rival colleges were as frequent then as now, the glass was removed beforehand from the windows or protected by netting, and special guards or "stage-keepers" were appointed, dressed in lace-trimmed suits of red, green, and white, and armed with staves, swords, daggers, and steel caps. Finally, after the excitement of a performance had subsided, the actors' costumes were packed away in a chest placed in the Audit-Chamber, where they were kept for another year.†

Into this sort of atmosphere Cowley, already predisposed toward the drama, entered. As he wrote in the dedication of *Love's Riddle* after reaching Cambridge, he discovered that there were certain traditions there in comedy, such as the necessity of a part for a philosopher—which he was careful to insert into his next play. Perhaps he found a vague hostility against him at first, such as is natural for boys to entertain against one who is harbingered with such a reputation as the precocious Cowley's. At least, the tone of the address "Ad Lectorem" prefaced to *Naufragium Jocularare* would

* Moore Smith, p. 24.

† *Ibid.*, pp. 31-48 *passim*.

at "some discrimination of character" and was "supported with more than juvenile equality of merit." *

The opinions of the most important modern critics have already been referred to, with the exception of two early writers on the pastoral, Josephine Laidler, who praised the play more highly than the *Amyntas*,† and Homer Smith, who thought that it "loses nothing in comparison with other pastoral dramas," ‡ and of Schelling, who asserts that it, "judged with its kind, stands in no need of any allowance for the author's youth." §

An unbiased student will not take an extreme position on either side. On the whole, Cowley's first play must be considered only as an unusual juvenile performance—and the merry chase which it has led its critics for sources would, if justified, prove the prodigiousness of the boy's reading at an age when most youths have sufficient to do to master their assigned lessons. *Love's Riddle* may possess a typical Cowleyan humour and a clever vein of satire, but it is emphatically lacking in the grace and interest of the best exemplars of its genre, such as Fletcher's *The Faithful Shepherdess*.

II. NAUFRAGIUM JOCLARE: A LATIN UNIVERSITY PLAY

The college to which young Abraham Cowley carried the manuscript of *Love's Riddle* boasted the most illustrious theatrical history of all the schools in Great Britain. According to statistics compiled by F. S. Boas and G. C. Moore Smith, plays were performed at Trinity seventy-two times between 1482 and 1747, the extreme dates covered by the Cambridge records, whereas during the same period only two hundred and twenty-five performances were given in the entire University.|| Moreover, after 1620, "Trinity and Queens' seem to have been the only colleges left in which plays were still performed with distinction" and "when the Restoration came, . . . Trinity College alone seems to have set itself to rival or eclipse the theatrical triumphs of the past. . . ." ¶

The extant records, accounts, etc., bring up a remarkably vivid picture of the amateur theatricals of Cowley's college. It is not

* *Retrospective Review*, 2nd Series, i. 376.

† Laidler, pp. 237-238.

‡ Homer Smith, p. 443.

§ F. E. Schelling, *Elizabethan Drama* (Boston and N. Y., 1908), ii. 176.

|| Boas, *University Drama in the Tudor Age* (Oxford, 1914), pp. 386-390; Moore Smith, pp. 50-72.

¶ Moore Smith, pp. 10, 14-15.

certain whether the "Comedy House" (for the day of academic tragedy had vanished) which it built for itself near the back of the Master's Lodge was put up before or after the Commonwealth, but it is known that its rival, Queens', erected its playhouse in 1638-39.* From documents of the periods just before and just after Cowley's time, one learns that the school paid sums varying from a few shillings to a couple of pounds for constructing necessary properties; that the "University Musick" was sometimes hired to play; that admission was sometimes by tickets made of wax; and that the hall was lighted with tallow or wax candles in iron candlesticks, with pitch in cressets, with torches, links, and lanthorns. Placards were still hung up on the stage to indicate the setting. Performances averaged five or six hours in length (clearly, these were amateur companies!), and began at any time from just before noon to the early evening, depending often on the pleasure and convenience of many noble and royal visitors, who came from the Palatinate and from Tuscany as well as from London, and were as frequently bored by the performances as not. Refreshments were served afterwards to put the audience in good humour—wine, burnt claret, canary, diet bread, or oranges. The actors, however, were rewarded with something more substantial—puddings, cheese, ale, loins and breasts of mutton, beer, bread and butter, canary, claret, pipes and tobacco. Inasmuch as riots with rival colleges were as frequent then as now, the glass was removed beforehand from the windows or protected by netting, and special guards or "stage-keepers" were appointed, dressed in lace-trimmed suits of red, green, and white, and armed with staves, swords, daggers, and steel caps. Finally, after the excitement of a performance had subsided, the actors' costumes were packed away in a chest placed in the Audit-Chamber, where they were kept for another year.†

Into this sort of atmosphere Cowley, already predisposed toward the drama, entered. As he wrote in the dedication of *Love's Riddle* after reaching Cambridge, he discovered that there were certain traditions there in comedy, such as the necessity of a part for a philosopher—which he was careful to insert into his next play. Perhaps he found a vague hostility against him at first, such as is natural for boys to entertain against one who is harbingered with such a reputation as the precocious Cowley's. At least, the tone of the address "Ad Lectorem" prefaced to *Naufragium Jocularare* would

* Moore Smith, p. 24.

† *Ibid.*, pp. 31-48 *passim*.

hint so. Nevertheless, he was destined to become the chief playwright at Trinity, for of the three plays given there between 1636 and 1642, the dates of his residence, two were his, the other being by a student named Nicols. Moreover, during the same period, the only other plays presented to the University were two at Corpus and one at Queens', so that Cowley wrote one-third of the total output.*

Being a linguist of considerable ability, the boy decided to write his second play in Latin, according to the old tradition of the academic drama. Consequently, on February 2, 1638-1639,† *Naufragium Joculare* was offered on the stage to the Trinitarians, apparently with such success that it was rushed to the printer's and presented to the reading public within six or seven weeks. Genest has suggested that Cowley himself acted some character, since the speaker of the prologue says in part, "He [the author] does not dare to appear before this assembly himself except masked [*personatus*; i.e. in an assumed character], and he is blushing deeper than his purple gown"—the colour of the Trinity undergraduate's garb.‡

Although, over a century later, Baker's *Companion to the Play-House* asserted that the plot of the play was "an original Invention," § more recent critics from Lamb onward have had their way with Cowley's inventiveness, though at the same time they have added to the sum of his learning. As the sources of *Love's Riddle* were traced first to Renaissance models, so the primary sources of *Naufragium Joculare* apparently were the classics.

In spite of the fact that the scene is laid in Dunkirk and the main characters are English, both are essentially unlocalised. Any sea-coast town would have done as well, and the persons are in the strain of Latin comedy rather than English. References to the "Puritani" (iv. v.),|| to "Nova Anglia" (iv. v.; v. viii.), and to "Cantabrigiae" (v. viii.), show that the action is contemporary.

Morion, a fool, and Gelasimus, a rich English student, priding himself on his wit, with their philosopher-tutor Gnomicus, also a

* Moore Smith, p. 70.

† See p. 2, note †. Cf. also the reference to "quarto Nonas Februarii" in i. v. *The Retrospective Review*, xi. (1825), 39, had said February 10, 1638, and Charles Johnson's preface to *Fortune in Her Wits* (London, 1705) had said February 4. Gosse (p. 202) says that it was published in February, though he offers no proof.

‡ [Genest], *Some Account of the English Stage* . . . (Bath, 1832), x. 64.

§ See Baker under *Naufragium Joculare*, i. n.p.

|| Moore Smith (p. 9) remarks on the "anti-Puritan spirit" of the play.

learned fool, land near Dunkirk after a terrible storm. (In his "Ad Lectorem" Cowley maintains that his play should please all but those who see themselves in these parts.) Reminiscences of Plautus begin to appear immediately—for instance, the parasite in the doubtful Plautine play, *Stichus*, is named Gelasimus; and Gnomicus is the conventional pedant. Dinon, the servant of the party (counterpart of dozens of amusing, intriguing servants in Roman comedy), sees his chance to advance himself at their expense and plots with Æmylio, a captive and servant of Bombardomachides, survival of the ancient favourite "miles gloriosus." (The name was probably suggested to Cowley by the "Bumbomachides" described by Pyropolinices, the original braggart soldier, in the first scene of the Plautus play.) Bombardomachides being absent from home, Æmylio and Dinon first make the three gulls drunk, then easily trick them into thinking that they have suffered a real shipwreck, and finally tumble them into the hold (the house of Bombardomachides) to plunder at their leisure. Thus ends the main part of the "laughable shipwreck" plot, which seemingly goes back, with considerable alteration, to the anecdote found in the anonymous epitome of Book II. Section 5, of the *Deipnosophists* of Athenaeus (third century), who gives credit for the story to Timaeus of Tauromenium.*

After the conspirators have dispatched a letter to Polyporus, the supposed father of Morion, demanding ransom, and just as the captives become slightly suspicious of their captors, who are masquerading as Bombardomachides and a guard, the real Bombardomachides returns with his daughter, Eucomissa, and Æmylio's sister, Ægle. To gain time and to prevent his master from discovering the three dupes, Æmylio introduces another plot, so that by Dinon's simulation of a "cacodaemon" the braggart soldier is frightened from his supposedly haunted house. (This portion of the plot all reverts to Plautus's *Mostellaria*, part of which Fielding later used in *The Intriguing Chambermaid*. The working-out, however, differs somewhat from Plautus, and the "spirit scenes" actually resemble more closely those of Grazzini's comedy translated

* Ward, in the *Camb. Hist. of Engl. Lit.*, vi. 116, n., and in *A History of English Dramatic Literature* . . . (London, 1899), ii. 566, n., and iii. 187, gives this source correctly. Schelling, however (ii. 88), mistakenly attributes the scene to Plautus's *Captivi*, which is responsible for a totally different part of the plot. For a more complete sketch of the history of the anecdote, see W. Bang and H. de Vocht, *Englische Studien*, xxxvi. (1906), 389-391.

into English as *The Bugbears* in 1561; however, it is unlikely that Cowley knew this play, as it was not published until 1897.*) The plot is further complicated by the appearance of the Calliphanes, *pater* and *filius*, the latter being engaged to Eucomissa against his will. As the conspirators are rejoicing in song over their success, however, Bombardomachides decides to send for an exorcist and thus spoils their plans.

From here on for a time the plot wavers somewhat (and it is just in these acts that no source has until the present been suggested for the material Cowley used). In these scenes, with the knowledge of their jailers, the captives establish a school of wit, in which the "ars jocandi" is to be taught. Although apparently no other plays have made use of a "school of joking," several from the time of Lyly and Jonson, have introduced satirical academic scenes.† The chief of these is Shirley's *Love Tricks* (1631), which bears the sub-title, "The School of Compliment," and contains a scene (III. v.) entitled in the text "The Compliment-School," wherein masters, pupils, etc., appear much as in Cowley's play. Middleton and Rowley's *A Fair Quarrel* (1617) also contains a scene (IV. i.) entitled "The Roaring School."‡

Although this part of *Naufragium Jocular* may be intended as a continuation of the "jocular" motif, still several of the passages attached to this thread of the story—such as those of the young scholar, the rival "professor," etc.—are extraneous to the development of the real plot. It is in these scenes, however, that Cowley unloads all his satire on education, schoolmasters, and students—too many pages, in fact, owe their existence merely to his love for a "jocus." His wit is of course the kind that would appeal to his young colleagues—full of puns and references to the authors taught at lesson-time. Snatches of Greek are introduced and mistaken for Hebrew or the language of the demons; and quotations from Virgil (usually not much more difficult than "Arma virumque cano"), and allusions to Horace, Ovid, Cicero, Erasmus, Luther, etc., appear in various situations and in garbled forms for comic and satiric effects. A considerable amount of satire upon methods of teaching and of disputation is well handled, except that the

* By C. Grabau, *Archiv für das Studium der neueren Sprachen und Literaturen*, xcvi. (1897).

† Cf. R. S. Forsythe, *The Relations of Shirley's Plays and the Elizabethan Drama* (Columbia Press, 1914), pp. 126-127.

‡ For further references to general specimens, see Forsythe, as above.

author reveals his own leanings toward them by his too florid representation.

In the meantime, Æmylio plans to marry Eucomissa's witty maid, Psecas, to Gelasimus, and she falls in with his scheme. Eucomissa, who really loves Æmylio, and Calliphanes filius, who really loves Ægle, determine to disobey their fathers and marry the two supposed slaves whom they love. After several difficulties they finally achieve success. Æmylio and Psecas in disguise dispute with the masters of the "schola jocandi," and Psecas entraps Gelasimus, who marries her in the assumed character of Eucomissa.

Polyporus arrives on the scene and is almost deceived by Æmylio and Dinon, but Bombardomachides, returning to disenchant his house, accidentally discovers their machinations. After he has had the pair flogged in true Roman comedy fashion, the three marriages are disclosed, and the necessary happy ending is provided by the revelation that Æmylio and Ægle are really the long-lost children of Polyporus. (Here again Cowley is indebted to Roman comedy, perhaps primarily to Plautus's *Captivi*, which was one of the first to use this theme, although the same author's *Rudens* and Terence's *Andria*, which are not usually mentioned by historians in this connection, are just as possible. Perhaps Cowley got his long-lost son from Plautus and his long-lost daughter from Terence! At any rate, his knowledge of Plautus is shown in his frequent references to the *Captivi* and the *Menaechmi* throughout the play.)

Finally, Polyporus announces his intention of disinheriting the foolish Morion, who, with the two other fools, declares his decision to return to Cambridge, where they will all open a new school of joking, for "Emptores jocosum ibi habitant quamplurimi."

With one of Cowley's classical training it is perhaps superfluous to look outside the classics for sources, but the fact is nevertheless undeniable that he could have got most of his material from an English dramatist whom he knew.* Lamb was the first to call attention to the story which Thomas Heywood had his Young Geraldine tell about Young Lionel and his drunken companions in *The English Traveler* (II. i.), which had been printed in 1633.† "This piece of pleasant exaggeration . . .," wrote Lamb, referring to the "laughable shipwreck" anecdote, "gave rise to the title of

* Cf. his reference to Heywood in his 1656 preface, in Grosart, i. cxxx.

† Lamb, *Specimens of the English Dramatic Poets*, in *Works* (London, 1903), iv. 100.

Cowley's Latin Play, *Naufragium Joculare*, and furnished the idea of the best scene in it." * He did not add, however, as did later critics such as Ward,† that the sub-plot of Heywood's comedy was also derived directly from Plautus's *Mostellaria*, so that the two episodes were already brought together for any one who wished to take them. If Cowley did so, however, it must be admitted that he altered them greatly. On the other hand, the links do not end there, for about 1624 Heywood had produced his play, *The Captives*, which not only had referred to the "Shipp-wrack by land" idea, but had based its main plot on another play by Plautus, *Rudens*, which ended with the discovery of *two* children, girls and cousins, lost through shipwreck in their infancy.‡ In other words, the essentials of *Naufragium Joculare* were available in Heywood without recourse to the classics.

In spite of its necessarily restricted audience, the play had sufficient good qualities to keep it alive for a great many years, chiefly as reading matter. Two insignificant Augustan dramatists, indeed, had enough confidence in its acting qualities to attempt it in translation. In 1705 Charles Johnson Englished it, somewhat in Cowley's own manner of "imitation," as *Fortune in Her Wits*, addressing his work especially to the ladies, whose "particular Favourite" he said his author had always been. Johnson rather rashly stated that *Naufragium Joculare* might "be allow'd to be much the best of his [Cowley's] Dramatick Performances," and praised its "neat and easy" language, its "artfully wrought" plot, and especially the character of Æmylio—all points which he expected to be proved when the play should "appear on the Stage with all the Ornaments of Dress, Light and Action." But his hope of production was never realised.§

The second enthusiast to try popularising Cowley was Daniel Bellamy, a Trinitarian himself, whose father, a Johnian of Oxford (to which college Cowley had fled when the Roundheads invaded Cambridge), had already worked his will with *Love's Riddle* for

* The *Retrospective Review*, xi. (1825), 144, went further and stated that Heywood's "most amusing description . . . gave Cowley the hint" for his play.

† Ward, *Camb. Hist.*, vi. 116, n.

‡ Cf. A. C. Judson, ed. of *The Captives* (New Haven, 1921), pp. 155, 9, 14, and text. The play, universally assigned to Heywood on good evidence, was not published until 1885.

§ [C. Johnson], *Fortune in Her Wits* (London, 1705), n.p. Genest, x. 65-66, considered that Johnson's translation was "not a bad one," though the *Biographia Dramatica* (1782 ed.) had called it "indifferent."

the young ladies' seminary and had probably also collaborated in this adaptation. In the preface to *The Perjur'd Devotee; or, The Force of Love* (1740) young Bellamy admitted that both Terence's *Andria* for the main plot and Cowley's *Naufragium Jocularare* for the sub-plot had been made free with, but one or two phrases in the preface make it seem not unlikely that he also knew Johnson's preface and translation. In Bellamy's play the cast as well as the plot is considerably reduced, the "spirits" and the "school of ioking" being omitted entirely. Even less than in the case of Johnson's translation has the world suffered much loss in the failure of Bellamy to persuade any manager to try his progeny on the boards.*

The critical history of the play has also been long and varied. Pepys spent the evening of February 19, 1660-1661, "in reading of a Latin play, the *Naufragium Jocularare*." † Langbaine, à Wood, Jacob, Cibber, the *Biographia Britannica*, Baker, and the *New and General Biographical Dictionary* all listed the play along with *Love's Riddle*. Those early writers who were actually critics as well as historians, however, were rather harsh with it. Dr. Johnson damned it in passing, saying that it was written "without due attention to the ancient models: for it is not loose verse, but mere prose"; ‡ moreover, "having neither the facility of a popular nor the accuracy of a learned work, it seems to be now universally neglected." § The same failure to observe the unities and the same criticism of the style forced a writer in the *Retrospective Review* to stigmatise it as "certainly the worst of the Latin plays we have read." || Even Grosart disposed of it hastily, saying that it "need not detain us long," but added that Johnson's translation "reflects nothing of the humour of the original." ¶ Gosse glided past it without showing much real familiarity with it,** but Ward praised its wit as "famous"

* Bellamy, D., sr. and jr., *Miscellanies in Prose and Verse* . . . (London, 1741), i. vi.-vii. and text. Conflicting dates are given for the first ed.—see Genest, i. 168. Allardyce Nicoll, *A History of Early Eighteenth Century Drama* (Cambridge, 1925), p. 261, quotes from the prolog.

† Pepys, *Diary and Correspondence* (London, 1882-1883), under date.

‡ Genest, x. 64, answers this objection by referring to the popularity of *Ignoramus*, written in prose by G. Ruggle and acted first at Trinity on March 8, 1614-1615.

§ S. Johnson, p. 4.

|| "Latin Plays Acted before the University of Cambridge," *Retros. Rev.*, xi. (1825), 39-40.

¶ Grosart, i. xlvii.

** Gosse, p. 202.

and "diverting,"* and Schelling called it "amusing," citing especially the "boisterous vivacity" of the shipwreck scene.†

Although the play is somewhat of an advance over *Love's Riddle* because it shows a nearer approach to reality, its chief claim to attention otherwise is the position it occupies in the Latin academic drama.

III. THE GUARDIAN : A SATIRICAL COMEDY OF MANNERS

From conventionalised, unreal shepherds and shepherdesses, to Romanised masters, servants, and students, to Puritans, rascally soldiers, and contemporary society—this was the course of Cowley's dramatic development while he was yet in school. He had taken his B.A. in 1639, and, having been chosen a minor fellow in the next year, was working toward his M.A. when the news came that the twelve-year-old Prince Charles ‡ would pause at Cambridge on Saturday, March 12, 1641-1642, on his way to York, toward the end of the long parliamentary struggle between King and Commons. Cowley, an ardent Royalist, given "one poor week" for preparation (see the epilog to *The Guardian*), immediately turned all his efforts to composing a suitable play to welcome him to Trinity. *The Guardian*, developing the incidental anti-Puritanism of *Naufragium Jocularé*, was the result.§

Cowley himself recognised the deficiencies of the play, for, as he apologised in the 1656 preface to his works,

it was neither *made* nor *acted*, but *rough-drawn* onely, and *repeated*; for the haste was so great that it could neither be *revised* or *perfected* by the *Author*, nor *learned* [with]out book by the *Actors*, nor set forth in any measure tolerably by the *Officers* of the *College*.||

Nevertheless, the play must have found favour with its partizan audience, for Cowley informed the readers of his 1663 preface to *Cutter of Coleman-Street* that it had been acted "several times after

* Ward, *Hist. Engl. Dram. Lit.*, iii. 187.

† Schelling, ii. 88.

‡ See S. Johnson, p. 5, n.

§ Cowley had by this time acquired the nickname of "y^e Poet Aquila" (see the Douce MSS., quoted by Moore Smith, p. 90, in the margin of which is written "Pooley," presumably for "Cooly"). "Aquila" may mean simply "the eagle," or may refer to the fifteenth century Italian poet, Serafina dell' Aquila, a popular imitator of Dante and Petrarch. The former meaning, considering Cowley's character and appearance, is the more likely.

|| Grosart, i. cxxvii.

privately during the troubles, as I am told, with good approbation, as it has been lately too at Dublin."* These statements are worth noting, since they show three interesting points: first, like many university plays, *The Guardian* was prepared for a royal visit; second, it is another example of the continued acting of plays—"privately"—during the Puritan regime; and third, if performed professionally, it must have been one of the first plays presented at John Ogilby's second Dublin theatre, which he built in 1662 and which got him into some passing trouble because he enticed one of Davenant's actors to desert and come to him.†

The Guardian was never printed under Cowley's authority and supervision, although, so great was his popularity, it was pirated and published in 1650 during its author's exile in France with the royal family. This occurrence caused him to feel a fellow-pity for Shakespeare, Fletcher, and Jonson, whose works had been similarly "stuffed out" after their deaths by indiscreet friends or avaricious stationers. Immediately after the representation he himself had been sufficiently interested in his play to revise it extensively, leaving out the parts of the poet Dogrel and the "sharking" Colonel Cutter, but he lost the copy and never rewrote it, though he confessed that there were some things in it which he was not ashamed of, considering his "age and small experience in humane conversation."‡ Nevertheless, prying editors have usually reprinted it, and the literary historians already mentioned always refer to it along with Cowley's other works. In addition, it is named in the 1797 edition of the *Encyclopaedia Britannica*,§ and Lamb reprinted one of its humorous passages in 1808.|| Gosse says: "The farcical part of the piece is in prose, but the grand personages, Lucia and her lover Trueman Junior, talk in blank verse. The part of a poet, Doggrell, is amusing, but insisted on too much";¶ and Nicoll is not greatly impressed with it.** No

* Grosart, i. 175.

† For the history of this theatre, see J. Q. Adams, *Shakespearean Playhouses* (Boston, 1917), pp. 417-419; and Gordon Goodwin, "Ogilby," *Dictionary of National Biography*, xlii. 15. Succeeding commentators, such as Langbaine, *Account . . .*, p. 81, and Jacob, pp. 49-50, state that the play was acted "publicly," though they give no authority.

‡ 1656 preface, in Grosart, i. cxxvii.

§ "Cowley," *Encyc. Brit.* (Edinburgh, 1797, 3rd ed.), v. 502.

|| Lamb, iv. 432.

¶ Gosse, p. 203.

** Nicoll, *A History of Restoration Drama* (Cambridge, 1923), p. 199.

strong cause exists for disagreeing with them, or with Cowley himself.

The history of academic plays as a real factor in the drama had now come to an end. "Cowley's *Guardian* was the last play following its precursors in regular order, and according to established custom, and may, therefore, be considered the last that was publicly represented." * Historically, it was also interesting because it "borrowed material . . . from the comedy of manners while preserving none the less a certain flavor of the universities," seen especially in its "reproduction of Plautine situations and personages" †—or rather, as will appear in a moment, in its more direct debt to Ben Jonson.

IV. CUTTER OF COLEMAN-STREET: A REVISION

Cowley's life-long interest in the drama was to culminate after the Restoration in his only professionally produced play, *Cutter of Coleman-Street*. The growth of his knowledge of theatres and plays lies open to any one who wishes to trace it in the copious allusions scattered through his works, though there is not space to discuss it here.‡

Partly to his own inventiveness, partly to his reading in the older comedians, and partly to some spare time which he found on his hands while alone in the country (see the preface), Cowley owed *Cutter of Coleman-Street*, a drastic revision of the old *Guardian*.§ Though the return of his old and honoured master, Prince Charles, as king had inaugurated a new era of pleasure-seeking, Cowley's remarks in the prolog concerning the fear with which at least ten other playwrights were watching his fortunes were probably not merely rhetoric. He had re-worked the old play, written so hastily for Charles, and had laid the scene in London on "the first of the seventh month, in the year of Grace 1658, and of Revelation, and Confusion of Carnal Monarchies the tenth" (as the wily and

* *Retro. Rev.*, xi. (1825), 41, n.

† Schelling, ii. 304.

‡ I have already treated his dramatic theories and critical opinions in my article, "Abraham Cowley's *Discourse concerning Style*," *Review of English Studies*, ii. (1926), 397-398. His knowledge of theatres and their customs may be seen as follows: Grosart, i. 26, 191, 200, 215, 217, 221, 225. His reading of the drama appears as follows: i. cxxvii., 26, 136, 182, 184, 189, 191, 199, 215, 221, 225, 228, 233; ii. 4, 21, 65, 109, 114; etc.

§ Genest, x. 63, however, says that "the changes made are not so great as Cowley represents them to be."

hypocritical Cutter tells Tabitha Barebottle). His friend Davenant had agreed to open his recently patented theatre, the "Opera" in Lincoln's Inn Fields, to the play, and the best members of the company, the Duke of York's, were assigned parts. Thomas Betterton, even then almost the leading actor of his day, took Colonel Jolly; Mrs. Betterton, who occupied the same place among the actresses, took Aurelia; and Nokes, to become the most popular of the low comedians, took Puny. The other parts were likewise well cast.* The date set was the evening of December 16, 1661.†

But things went wrong from the first. The King could not attend the initial performance.‡ Cowley's brother had died just before, and the playwright, therefore, felt obliged to remain at home.§ And he must have known that many of his own party considered him to have acted in too conciliatory a manner toward the Cromwellians at the end of the Protectorate.

But some of Cowley's friends were present—John Dryden, for instance, accompanied by Cowley's future biographer Sprat, later Bishop of Rochester. Sam Pepys was there with his wife, having just come from dinner and sitting in the gallery because of having had to pay double for a first performance. Hardly had the action begun, however, before the audience started to voice its disapproval—so quickly, indeed, that Cowley in his preface concluded that there must have been some "*Faction against it.*" Apparently part of the audience cried out that it was an abuse and a satire of the King's party, inasmuch as Cutter and Worm, merry scoundrels though they were, were masquerading as Cavaliers. Later on, others objected to the character of Jolly, a true gentleman and Royalist, who yielded to the temptation of gaining his niece and ward's fortune by unscrupulous means. Still others pretended to find too much profaneness in the dialog. All these charges Cowley later easily defended himself against in his preface to the printed play (1663), by indicating simply what a "*rash and imprudent person*" he would have been to pick out the present time to begin a quarrel after having supported the party during the twenty years of its vicissitudes. The final speech of Lucia in Act I. Scene vi. also has

* Downes, *Roscius Anglicanus*, in Genest, i. 40; also Thomas Davies, ed. of Downes, in [Francis Waldron's] *The Literary Museum* . . . (London, 1792), p. 35.

† Grosart, i. xxvi. says December 8; but see Pepys and Genest.

‡ See the prolog and epilog "Added at Court."

§ See John Dennis, "A Large Account of the Taste in Poetry," in Durham, *Critical Essays of the XVIII Century* (New Haven, 1915), pp. 131-132.

all the ear-marks of being inserted after the first performance as a defense against the outburst of the first-nighters.* But when Sprat and Dryden went immediately to the author's house afterwards with their bad news, they found him not yet a complete philosopher; for, in Dryden's phrase, he "received the news of his ill success, not with so much firmness, as might have been expected from so great a man."†

Nevertheless, the company persevered, and Downes, the prompter at the theatre, was enabled to record that the play, "being acted so perfectly well and exact, . . . was performed a whole week with a full audience."‡ And in spite of Downes's further statement that, being but "a temporary Satire, [it] was soon banished the Theatre," *Cutter of Coleman-Street* proved that its author had learned something about writing for the stage by continuing to be acted for sixty years. It was given again on August 5, 1668, at the same place, though with the old title of *The Guardian*;§ was revived on October 5, 1702, under the alternate titles; was given a new prolog to be spoken by Pack and was transferred to Drury Lane on August 1, 1711; and received its final recall on November 1, 1723, at the original theatre.||

One outcome of the events of the first night was Cowley's own poem, "The Complaint," in which he gave himself a title which

* It is remarkable that Pepys's diary entry, though mentioning the material of the play, says nothing of the disturbance and seems a bit doubtful of the authorship. It is also remarkable that after this performance he called it "a very good play," whereas after seeing it again on August 5, 1668, he called it "a silly play."

† Dennis, p. 132.

‡ See Waldron, p. 35; Grosart, i. xxvi. Langbaine, *Dram. Poets*, p. 81, corroborates this statement by saying, "I have seen it acted with universal applause." Yet A. H. Thompson, *Camb. Hist.*, vii. 71-72, says unqualifiedly that the play "was a failure on the stage."

§ Pepys, *Diary*, under date.

|| See Genest, ii. 262, 500, and iii. 142. It is difficult to tell whether the play listed as *The Guardian* in the Lord Chamberlain's Department of the Public Record Office (see Nicoll, *Rest. Dr.*, pp. 309, 310, 315-316) is Cowley's or Massinger's. The first two records, dealing with performances given at Court by the Duke's company on November 17, 1672, and January 8, 1674, very probably pertain to Cowley's *Cutter* which Pepys's entry shows to have been known as *The Guardian*. If so, the Cavalier opposition to the play could not have had much foundation. Nicoll's final document, however, listing a "*Gardian*" as one of the plays re-assigned to "his Maies Servants at y^e New Theatre" in January 1668-1669, more likely refers to Massinger's play. It is otherwise difficult to explain how Killigrew would have any right to it. Baker's account of the *Cutter* in 1764 stated that the play had been revived "within these thirty years," but no records of such a performance exist. Similarly, he said that the first presentation had taken place at Salisbury Court.

was destined to stick—"the melancholy Cowley"; another was an anonymous satire on the choice of a laureate, in which his play, his prolog to his friend Tuke's *The Adventures of Five Hours* (1663), and his unfulfilled aspiration to the mastership of the famous charity "hospital," the Savoy, were all satirized:

Savoy-missing Cowley came into the court,
Making apologies for his bad play;
Every one gave him so good a report,
That Apollo gave heed to all he could say;
Nor would he have had, 'tis thought, a rebuke,
Unless he had done some notable folly;
Writ verses unjustly in praise of Sam Tuke,
Or printed his pitiful Melancholy.*

Posterity, however, has not universally agreed with this judgment of the play. Richard Hurd, editing a selection from Cowley in 1772, wrote:

This comedy has considerable merit. The dialogue is easy enough, and many of the scenes pleasant . . . , though the subject be farcical, and the plot too much in the Spanish taste of intrigue. . . .†

A correspondent in the *Gentleman's Magazine* (1776) lamented with Hurd that there had not been room for the *Cutter* in the edition.‡ Dr. Johnson, usually a hard critic, found it difficult to account for the treatment of the comedy, saying that "it certainly has, in a very great degree, the power of fixing attention and exciting merriment."§ The anonymous but discriminating critic in Anderson's *Poets of Great Britain* came closer home than Hurd and detected "something of the rough vigorous wit, and strong-marked character of the comedies of Ben Johnson[sic]."|| Lamb went so far as to consider the *Cutter* "the link between the Comedy of Fletcher and of Congreve," but he betrayed his poor taste by referring to the "elegant passion" of the love scenes.¶ Genest thought the revision much better than *The Guardian*, especially in the improvement and rearrangement

* Grosart, i. xxvi. J. L. McBryde, "A Study of Cowley's *Davideis*," reprinted from the *Journal of English and German Philology*, ii. (1899), no. 4, notes that these verses have been wrongly attributed to Suckling by Leslie Stephen in the *Dict. Nat. Biog.* under "Cowley." Perhaps Stephen was misled by S. Johnson's reference to Suckling in the same context with the satire (Johnson, "Cowley," pp. 14-15).

† Hurd, *Select Works of Mr. A. Cowley* (London, 1777), i. 91, n.

‡ *Gent. Mag.*, xlv. (June, 1776), 267. See also *Biog. Brit.*, iv. 380, and *Encyc. Brit.* (1797), v. 502.

§ S. Johnson, p. 14.

|| Anderson, v. 202-203.

¶ Lamb, iv. 432.

of the plot.* The *Retrospective Review*, in extolling Cowley's prose, chose two long extracts from the humorous parts of the *Cutter* to show his "great spirit" and capability of "exciting our sympathy," although the play often came nearer to farce than to comedy; the serious parts, on the other hand, the article said, are "a very successful imitation of our elder dramatists, and show that Cowley, when he chose, could modulate his verses to rhythm."† Grosart seems to be the only one to prefer the first version of the comedy, in which he found in "various respects . . . more vigour, more abandon, more of the characteristics of Cowley . . . than in the somewhat smoothened and adapted 'Cutter.'"‡ Yet in the face of all these encomiums Gosse, a Cowley admirer, wrote that both on the stage and in print the play received "the disapproval of the critics"!§ Allardyce Nicoll put himself in opposition to a weighty body of opinion when he said in 1923:

. . . Save for a few touches of more refined wit, and in spite of Lamb's enthusiasm for it, it seems to be remarkable in no very particular way, although, as Elia has pointed out, the character of Puny does have a certain interest in that he was the ancestor of the "half-witted wits" of a later period.||

Nicoll, however, is right in classifying the play among the "humour" comedies which produced the "farce type of drama proper in the later years of the century."

A simple perusal of the *dramatis personae* is sufficient to prove Cowley's indebtedness to Jonson, even without noting his references to "humours" in the play itself.¶ And if Cowley is indebted to Jonson for his characterisation, he is similarly indebted to the Spanish intrigue type of comedy popularised by Fletcher for his plotting. Love and marriage are a game to be prosecuted by tricks and stratagems, and the play is filled with disguises, mistaken identities, and meetings in darkened chambers. It would be a treasure trove to some modern moving-picture farce writer. But, for its type, it is well put together. Cowley's changes in plot manipulation between the two versions are particularly interesting to a student of dramaturgy, and no one with any theatrical sense will

* Genest, i. 40.

† *Retro. Rev.*, 2nd series, i. (1827), 356, 362, 376-386.

‡ Grosart, i. 174.

§ Gosse, p. 204.

|| Nicoll, *Rest. Dr.*, p. 199.

¶ See, however, v. ii.; and in *The Guardian*, i. vi.; ii. iii.; iv. vii.

question the superiority of the final draft in effectiveness for presentation, in economy and arrangement of material, and in motivation of characters. In both plays, however, the unities of time and place are observed, with considerable crowding.

But although such an analysis shows how Cowley really acquired some dramatic technic, the two plays are chiefly interesting to-day because of the social pictures they present—one having been composed just before the seizure of power by the Puritans, and the other just before the restoration of the monarchy. In both cases a wealth of details produces a distinctly local and indigenous background, which is not, of course, to be set up beside that of Dekker, for instance, but which still will not suffer extinction by the comparison.

The style of these two comedies of manners is hardly prepared for in any other of Cowley's works, though certain familiar passages in his essays approach it. His dialog is racy and fluent, especially as he becomes older, but his prose is certainly preferable to his verse, which is much like that of *Love's Riddle* in its irregularities. There are a few typical conceits, but very few. The wit is sometimes dependent upon puns, but not often; and Cowley gets his chief effect by satire (often resembling the savage Donnian satire of one or two juvenile poems) at the expense of quack physicians, conceited courtiers, hypocritical preachers, lying lawyers, etc., as well as of the Puritans and "cutters." He has clearly told himself that he is to write as a play-maker rather than a poet, and only when he lets his poetical self loose in his serious scenes does he become dull.

V. THE REHEARSAL : A COLLABORATED BURLESQUE ?

One more possible dramatic venture completes the picture of Cowley's versatility. In 1671 the Duke of Buckingham produced his burlesque, *The Rehearsal*, which had been begun some eight years earlier in order to ridicule Davenant and the Howards, but by the time of its actual appearance had become chiefly a caricature of Dryden, animosity against whom had been preparing for over a decade and had culminated when he had been appointed laureate two years after his predecessor, Davenant's, death in 1668.

In the preface to Edmund Waller's *Poems* (1712) is found the following statement about *The Rehearsal*: "It is said Mr. Waller had a hand in it, with Mr. Clifford, Mr. Cowley, and some other

wits."* To these names Dr. Johnson added those of Samuel Butler and Dr. Sprat.† Although Cowley had died in 1667, there seems to be no external reason why he could not have aided in the first draft, for most of these men were intimates of his: Sprat, as his literary executor, addressing his work to Clifford; and Buckingham, one of Cowley's chief patrons, setting up a marble monument over the poet's tomb in Westminster Abbey. On the other hand, it seems rather unlikely that Cowley, always a very amicable and unoffending person, should have gone out of his way to insult men who had been both his friends and his admirers. He had written a very extravagant eulogy of the first two books of Davenant's *Gondibert*, and the *Cutter* had been produced in Davenant's theatre. Moreover, not until many years after Cowley's death did Dryden say anything which might by any stretch of the imagination be construed as otherwise than in Cowley's praise.‡ Finally, it is impossible to identify any passages in the play as being in Cowley's style.

The arguments seem to cancel. All that can be said with certainty is that if Cowley, being a famous wit of the day, being under obligations to Buckingham, and being interested in the theatre, so far forgot his previous relationships with Davenant and Dryden as to help ridicule them in *The Rehearsal*, then his casual contribution, the dramatic work which he thought least of and put least time on, is—and the statement applies as well to all of his writings—the one which is still most alive and esteemed by posterity.

* Waller, *Poems* (London, 1712), p. 37.

† S. Johnson, i. 282, 368.

‡ See my articles, "The Reputation of Abraham Cowley, 1660-1800," *P.M.L.A.*, xxxviii. (1923), 588-641 *passim*; and "The Reputation of the 'Metaphysical Poets' during the Seventeenth Century," *J.E.G.P.*, xxiii. (1924), 193-196.

WAS BISHOP WILLIAM BARLOW FRIAR JEROME BARLOW?

À PROPOS OF *Rede me and be not wroth* AND OTHER EARLY
PROTESTANT DIALOGUES

BY A. KOSZUL

THE following notes do not claim to solve the knotty little problem summarised in our title, but only to state it in somewhat more definite terms than seems to have been done hitherto—and also, by the way, to point out some errors which seem to cling with peculiar tenacity to this humble department of literary and bibliographical history.

William Barlow, Bishop of St. Asaph and other places (?-1568), has been of considerable interest to ecclesiastical litigants, as on the disputed fact of his regular consecration depends to a certain extent the great question of the validity of Anglican Orders. As a bishop, he undoubtedly struck between Tradition and Reform a *via media* that appears to modern eyes to have been very sinuous indeed. "A man he was," old Fuller already said with his neat sort of humour, "of much motion and promotion."* But his pre-episcopal career is obscure, and the historian of the Church is apt to pass over it rather cursorily.

The historian of Literature on the other hand has a little, all too little, to say about a more shadowy Jerome Barlow, a disgruntled friar who *circa* 1528-1530 had at least a hand in some of the most violent writings directed against the old Church.

Is "Jerome Barlow" an early and particularly "protestant" avatar of Bishop "William Barlow"?

The identification was suggested long ago, by Christopher Anderson, in his *Annals of the English Bible* (1845, vol. i. p. 205,

* *Worthies*, ed. Nichols, 1811, vol. ii. p. 389,

v. 46 *). It was taken for granted by Adolf Wolf in his reprint of a Dialogue of which we shall have to speak at the end of this Paper (*Sitzungsberichte der philosophisch-historischen Classe der Kaiserlichen Akademie*, Vienna, 1874, vol. 76, p. 393), whilst, quite independently, Professor Herford in his pioneer book on *The Literary Relations of England and Germany in the Sixteenth Century* (1886, Index, p. 409) spoke of "Barlow, Jerome, also called William"—which probably means that Professor Herford was thinking of the Bishop.

And yet, curiously enough, Bishop Barlow's biographers have not considered the point. Indeed, I am not sure they have seen it. At any rate, neither Cooper (*Athenæ Cantabrigienses*, 1858, vol. i. p. 276) nor Professor Tout (*Dict. of Nat. Biog.*, 1885) nor quite recently Monsignor A. S. Barnes (*Bishop Barlow and Anglican Orders*, 1922)† seem to have suspected any connection between their hero—or rather, on the more hopeful view, the subject of their mild apology—and the obscure author of *Rede me and be not wroth*. *Vice versa* the commentators of *Rede me*, who think of their Barlow—Professor Arber, *English Reprints*, vol. xxviii., 1871, pp. 9–14; Professor Kölbing, *Cambridge Hist. of Eng. Literature*, 1909, vol. iii. p. 80—do not hint at the later promotion of the writer of this satire.‡

Now these seem to be the facts and the difficulties of the case.

I

One of the earliest documents that we possess in the hand of "William Barlo" is a piteous letter of recantation to King Henry VIII. (Cotton MSS., Cleopatra E. iv.: printed in *Letters relating to the suppression of the monasteries*, Camden Society, vol. 26, 1843, p. 6), in which he apologises for having written "and suffered to be empyrnted . . . the treatyse of the buryall of the masse, a dyalogue betwene the gentyllman and husbandman," and some other

* An inconspicuous note it is, and neither Barlow has a place in the index of the work.

† Cf. the important review of this book by the Rev. Claude Jenkins, in the *Journal of Theological Studies*, 1922, vol. xxiv.

‡ Professor Kölbing, however, without adverting to the change of Christian name, observes that Barlow "recanted in 1533 and wrote, probably very soon after, a somewhat feeble *Dialogue upon the origin of the protestant fashions* [sic!]." This early use of the word "protestant" startles the reader, and makes him conscious that the professor was misquoting the title as well as suggesting a wrong date for the pamphlet in question.

works now lost. The titles we have here recited—the first ones in the list—are those which claim our attention.

(a) The "Burial of the Mass" must be the poem which we are now accustomed to call *Rede me and be not wroth*—after the slyly irritating lines which are found on the title-page. A dialogue in verse, and mainly a satire against Cardinal Wolsey and the Roman clergy, the poem includes a most curious introductory part which describes with astonishing minuteness and accuracy of local knowledge the course of the early Reformation at Strasburg,* and discusses with roguish humour the question of the "burying" of the mass, there "lately deceased." As the little book of 144 pages shows no title and no author's name, it is perfectly natural that it should have usually been referred to at the time as "liber qui de sepultura missæ rhythmico sermone vernaculo compositus est" (*Statuta et ordinationes prælatorum in concilio provinciali Cantuariensi*, 5 November, 1529; Wilkins, *Concilia* . . ., 1737, iii. p. 719), or as "the Burying of the Mass in English rhyme" (memorandum of a proclamation made at Paul's Cross, 3 December, 1531, *Calendar of State Papers*, Henry VIII., v. p. 768), or again as "the blasphemouse boke entytled the beryeng of the masse" (Thomas More, *The Supplicacyon of soulys* [1529], fol. xix verso), etc.†

If the confession above quoted is a genuine one, there does not seem to be any possible doubt that "William Barlo" did write *Rede me*.

And the ascription appears all the more likely when we remember (what I think has not been pointed out with reference to our problem) that the future bishop's uncontested production,‡ his *Dialogue*

* Professor Arber and Professor Herford have done almost all that is necessary to explain the Strasburg allusions in the poem. One might add perhaps that the "Celarius" who is mentioned side by side with Bucer, Capito, etc. (*Eng. Reprints*, p. 40) is not "Johann Kelner or Keller" (*ibid.*, p. 3) but Andreas K. Keller, who settled in Alsace about 1524 and was much appreciated at Strasburg (cf. *Allgemeine Deutsche Biographie*, vol. li., Nachträge, pp. 98–99). Perhaps a new edition of *Rede me*, which would give the variants of the 1546 text (cf. *infra*, p. 32), would be acceptable.

† This identification of *Rede me* and "The Burial of the Mass" is indeed generally admitted, and I believe it has never been questioned. But it seems occasionally to have been forgotten even by the critics who accept it. Watt, for instance, recalls it, s.v. Nycolson (*Bibliotheca Britannica*, 1824: "Authors," vol. ii.), but he does not remember it when, s.v. Barlow, he mentions "The Burial of the Mass." In the same way Professor Tout apparently did not think of *Rede me* when he quoted the titles given in Barlow's letter (*Dict. of Nat. Biog.*).

‡ At least I do not find that recent writers have been persuaded by Burnet's attempt to throw doubt upon the authorship of this book—of which he knew only

describing the originall ground of these Lutheran factions (W. Rastell, 1531), very much as *Rede me*—though no longer in the same spirit—has a lot to tell us about his visit to Germany, and particularly about his stay in “Argentine,” i.e. the great city of Strasburg.

(b) The second title in Barlow's letter of recantation is to-day, and has been for some sixty-five years, more than a title. *The proper dyaloge betwene a gentillman and a husbandman*, a unique copy of which was discovered by Lord Arthur Hervey in 1861, bound up with other rarities, and can now be seen at the British Museum, is obviously the dialogue which “William Barlo” puts on a par with “The Burial of the Mass.” *Rede me* and the *Dialogue* are clearly twin productions; the *Dialogue* also is really a satirical poem, and it is built on exactly the same lines as *Rede me*; it has a short preface (in rhyme; the other one was in prose), an introduction in stanzas of the type *ababbcc* with a burthen or tag at the end of each, a “lamentation” by way of opening the case, and a dialogue in which the same rhyme scheme *aabccb* is used throughout. The lines are of the rather flabby kind that was inherited from the fifteenth century. The *Dialogue* differs from *Rede me* principally in that it includes two rather long passages in prose—but these claim to be mere reproductions of some earlier pamphlets. In both poems the vocabulary, the careless colloquial turn of the sentences, the rough mother wit too, and occasionally the spirited if decidedly vulgar invective, are the same.*

As bad luck would have it, the letter of recantation of William Barlow, with its definite confession of authorship, although the *Athenæ Cantabrigienses* in 1858 had quoted it extensively, and Anderson had called attention to it in 1845, was apparently forgotten by the editors of *Rede me* (Chiswick Press reprint, 1845), of the *Dialogue* (Francis Fry, 1863),† or of both (Professor Arber, *op. cit.*

the second edition, Cawood, 1553 (*Hist. of the Reformation* . . . , Part II. Book ii.; ed. Nares, vol. ii. pp. 428–429, and Appendix, vol. iv. pp. 611–612).

* It seems a pity that one of these passages, *A compendious olde treatyse* . . . , having been printed separately, in the same year 1530, should appear as a different work in the admirable *Short title Catalogue* . . . of Messrs. A. W. Pollard & G. R. Redgrave (Bibliog. Society, 1926, s.v. Bible, Appendix. The *Dialogue betwene a Gentleman and a Husbandman* is not attributed by them to William Barlow, but figures as a purely anonymous publication, s.v. “Dialogues”).

† It occurred to Fry (Introduction, p. 12) that the passage of Tyndale which we quote (p. 29) attributed certain “rhymes” to a certain “friar Jerome,” and he thought for a moment that they might be the *Dialogue* he was reprinting. But he soon added without giving any reason beyond the likeness of the *Dialogue* and

1871). Surely, if it had been remembered, they could hardly have failed to identify the two poems with the two "convivious" publications which are first acknowledged by the future bishop in his letter to the King, as if they were the head and front of his offending.

"Habemus confitentem reum"—one is tempted to think, that settles it. But as a matter of fact, the simple conclusion we seem to have reached is not altogether without its difficulties. We shall now consider them as candidly and briefly as possible.

II

First of all there is the usual ascription of *Rede me* to William Roy and Jerome (rather than William) Barlow. In fact, William Roy, Tyndale's well-known assistant in the famous translation of the *New Testament*, is generally named first in this connection, as if he had the larger share in the Strasburg satire.*

Now this notion, if I am not mistaken, rests mainly on a text of Tyndale which has been strangely misinterpreted. Says Tyndale, in the Preface to his *Parable of the Wicked Mammon* (dated in the colophon, May 8, 1528):

Twelve monethes before the printinge of this worke, came one Jerō a brother of Grenewich also, thorow Wormes to Argētine to kepe (as nye God wolde gyue him grace) the profession of his baptism, and to gett his lyving with his handes,† and to lyue no longer ydely and of the swete and laboure of those captyues whiche they had taught, not to byleue in Chryst: but in cuttshewes and russet coates. When he was comen to Argentine, William Roye . . . gate him to him and sett him a werke to make rimes, while he him self translated a dialoge out of laten in to englysch, in whose prologe he promyseth moare a greate deall than I fere me he will ever paye.

"This passage," says Professor Arber (*op. cit.*, p. 11) "indubitably fixes the authorship of *Rede me* upon these two Franciscan friars; more particularly assigning to Barlow its expression and to

Rede me (which he supposed to be the work of Roy): "the weight of probability is altogether in favour of Roy."

* Both the Catalogue of the Bodleian Library and the *Short title Catalogue* . . . (Bibliog. Society, 1926) still ascribe *Rede me* to William Roy exclusively.

† The idea that priests, monks, and friars ought to work as laymen, is one of those which, in his *Dialogue* . . . of these Lutheran factions, William Barlow admits having entertained in his unregenerate days. This further link between Tyndale's "friar Jerome" and Bishop Barlow has not, I believe, been observed.

Roy its matter." Surely this stretches the natural meaning of Tyndale's words: William Roy "setting friar Jerome a work" may very well imply no more than that he encouraged, persuaded his newly sworn friend to "make rhymes." In fact, it may be surmised that no one would have understood Tyndale differently if, in other contemporary evidence, Roy's name had not been given, with more or less confidence, as that of the writer. An early example is found in a letter of that puny busy-body, friar John West of Greenwich, who for a few months in 1528-1529 seems to have forced himself upon Cardinal Wolsey as heretic-hunter in the Low Countries. He mentions, on September 2, 1528 (S.P. Henry VIII., vol. 50),* "Petygnele, Roy and one Jerome Burlowe boȝth friars off owr Relygyon and Hychthyns othrwis callyd Tyndall" as having "made y^e boke y^t was last made agaynst the Kyngs hyennesse and my lord cardynall"; he adds, quite correctly, that "one John Scott a prynter off Straysbou[rg] prynted them"—but he forgets to explain his sudden change from the singular to the plural. Here Roy is only one of a group of four. In a letter of the German agent of the Cardinal, Hermann Rinck of Cologne, a few weeks later, on October 4 (*ibid.*), "Roy and Huckynck" are the culprits. All this, however, shows nothing but the vague suspicions of the inquisitors: they would in the nature of things be the last to be "in the know." In the same way, writing no doubt about the same time, we find Thomas More attributing the satire (*Rede me*) very hesitatingly to Tyndale: "we be not yet sure," he admits, and he remembers that Tyndale himself ascribes it to "one Friar Hierome" (*Dialogue concernynge heresyas . . . made in M.D. XXVIII.*). Another passage of More, which has been quoted by Professor Arber (*op. cit.*, p. 12), is really quite as non-committal: "Then cam sone after out in prynt the dyaloge of frere Roy and frere Hyerome, betwene y^e father and y^e sonne agaynst ye sacrament of y^e autler: and the blasphemouse boke entytled the beryeng of the masse" (*Supplicacyon of Soulys . . .*,

* We here quote the passages of the records, in the State Papers, which have been either curtailed or overlooked in Professor Arber's otherwise excellent introduction. It should be noted that the index in Brewer's *Calendar* is incomplete, and that a good deal could be done to pursue the search after the elusive "Jerome Barlow" with the help of friar West's ill-written letters. But as I am afraid the attempt does not lead to any positive results, I refrain from burthening these pages with more quotations. One detail perhaps deserves mentioning: "Jerome Barlow" according to West was distinguished by his red hair (John West to Cardinal Wolsey, June 12, 1529). Unfortunately, there do not seem to be extant any portraits of William Barlow (*Notes and Queries*, 6th S. xi. p. 288).

published in the summer of 1529).^{*} The first definite attribution of *Rede me* to William Roy that I can find occurs in Bale, *Scriptorum illustrium . . . posterior pars*, 1559, p. 102; and it seems as if the character of that work had—as is the wont of general works of reference to this day—established a tradition in favour of Roy's authorship: Tanner, Ritson, Watt, Park (in the *Harleian Miscellany*), Brydges, all follow in the wake of Bale.

On the whole, such hearsay sort of information might not be sufficient to turn the scales against William Barlow's definite confession—a confession, let us note, which does not in the least attempt to shift even a part of his responsibility on to another man's shoulders.

And yet it is true that Tyndale, speaking as he does—as having indeed met him—of “one Jerome of Greenwich,” is not an ideal witness for the advocates of the identification theory. William Barlow, as far as we know, was no Franciscan friar of Greenwich, Kent, but had been—years before, apparently, as he was already prior of Blackmore in 1509—an Augustinian Canon of St. Osyth, Essex. Was Tyndale mistaken, perhaps intentionally misinformed, on this point?

Again, William Barlow is certainly not, as once supposed by the editor of the *Calendar of State Papers* for that period, the Barlow who was sent to Rome on the divorce business in 1528 †—a notion which would have been impossible to reconcile with that of his presence in Strasburg at the same date. And yet he does mention, in the same *Dialogue . . . of these Lutheran factions* which reminds us of his intimacy with the German heretics, a short stay in the Eternal City. Is this stay to be squeezed in between the composition of the verse dialogues and that of the prose one on the “Lutheran factions”?

Again, how shall we account for the fact that the *Dialogue between a Gentleman and a Husbandman*, which shows all the signs, as we have seen, of having been written very much at the same time as

^{*} It is remarkable that Thomas More, who mentions a large number of heretical books lately published in his *Confutation of Tyndale's Answer* of 1532, kept silent at that date on “The Burial of the Mass,” as if he knew that “William Barlo” had recanted, and as if he did not wish to shame the repentant sinner. Cf. his similar treatment of George Constantine (*English Works*, 1557, p. 347).

† The references in Brewer's index to the fourth volume of the *Calendar of State Papers: Henry VIII.* (1876) are misleading, as pointed out by J. Gairdner (*Calendar . . .*, vol. vi. p. ix, 1882; cf. also Brewer, ed. Gairdner, *The Reign of Henry VIII.*, p. 223).

Rede me, was only published—not indeed by Hans Luft at Marburg, as it claims to be, but probably at Antwerp *—in 1530, that is, at a time when “William Barlo” must have been meditating his return to the fold. Was this second dialogue of his published without his knowledge, by some companion of his German travels and of his German errors? But then, why did he not protest, in his letter of recantation, against such use having been made of his derelict manuscripts?

And again, “The Burial of the Mass” was not only published, in far-off Strasburg, about 1528, to be once for all condemned by its author, and consigned to eternal oblivion. It reappeared curiously “at Wesel,” printed by “Henry Nycolson”—the real printer was Richard Jugge, in London †—“in the year of Our Lord 1546,” at a time when the Catholic reaction of the end of King Henry’s reign was striking desolation into so many Protestant hearts. William Barlow had then been a bishop for more than ten years; he was occupying the see of St. David’s, and quarrelling most vigorously with his chapter. Did he have anything to do with this new edition of his satire, and especially with the alterations which changed its attack on Cardinal Wolsey into a wholesale denunciation of the “papistical” clergy? The whole Preface to this second publication of *Rede me* suggests that the original writer was not consulted, that he was thought to have departed this life altogether. But even so can we imagine Bishop Barlow’s feelings, and his silence, when confronted with this belated reappearance of his “péché de jeunesse”?

These difficulties may well seem to make up a dangerously long list. None however is quite insuperable. Perhaps the most formidable (the difference in the Christian names and religious callings of the two Barlows) finds a satisfactory answer in a document which has probably escaped the attention of the Bishop’s biographers, as it has only recently been published (by M. Ch. Bémont, in the *Bibliothèque de l’Ecole des Hautes Etudes*, No. 221, Paris, 1917). It is a Roman Catholic account of the divorce of Henry VIII., written c. 1557; we read there (p. 75) the very rude but very illuminating lines:

* R. Steele, “Notes on English books printed abroad, 1525–1548” in *Transactions of the Bibliog. Society*, vol. xi.

† Duff, E. G., *A Century of the English Book Trade*, 1905, p. 110.

Barlous animal potius amphebion erat, qui per omnes religiosorum ordines ad episcopatum, post etiam ad uxorem decurrens, nullo certo nec ordine nec nomine nec colore teneri voluit; nec solum toties cucullatus, sed, uxore a servis vitiata, toties etiam cuculus est creditus. . . .

Here at last we have some authority to believe that William Barlow's name and order may have suffered a sea change in crossing, or before he crossed, the Channel to travel up the Rhine country. But more definite and unbiased information on the point would be desirable.

Pending which, we submit it is reasonable to take "William Barlo's" word for it. Perhaps indeed it is quite delightful, at least to a slightly sceptical and cynical observer, to contemplate the course of these early years of Barlow—such a perfect model to his future greatness, and to imagine that he wrote *Rede me* and the *Dialogue between a Gentleman and a Husbandman circa 1527-1528*; that he recanted *circa 1531* at a time when the bishops and the King himself had pilloried his books in their proclamations; that in the same year, still faithful to his favourite dialogue form (though he used prose this time instead of verse, and a not unpleasant sort of humour instead of rather gross satire *) he published his memoirs on the origin of the Lutheran schism; and that henceforward he went on his more prosperous career, to the glorious days when, a married (perhaps not quite happily married) bishop, he begat five daughters who all married bishops in their turn. . . .

Supposing, then, William Barlow to have been a more prolific author than is generally supposed, as the only begetter of these two satires, we may, in a concluding note, observe that his quondam associate William Roy would still have something to show as a controversialist. Indeed, we must emphasise, in the face of curiously reiterated statements to the contrary, the fact that his undisputed work, his "Dialogue between a Christian Father and his stubborn son," assuredly the one to which Tyndale referred in the passage above quoted, is not and has never been lost.† The original

* None but lovers of the most luridly scathing style will, I think, agree with Professor Kölbing, when he stigmatises this dialogue as "somewhat feeble" (*Cambridge History* . . . , vol. iii. p. 80). Its comparative restraint would rather seem, if anything, astonishingly superior to the violence of *Rede me* and the other *Dialogue* in artistic value.

† Professor Arber, 1871, p. 12, "apparently now lost." Professor Herford, 1886, p. 44, "remains neither in the original . . . nor in the translation. . . ." Professor Kölbing, 1909, p. 80: "the translation as well as the original are lost."

edition, it is true, was only discovered in Vienna in 1872 (cf. Wolf's Reprint, *op. cit.*, p. 391, 1874). It does not bear the title which we should expect, but is modestly called: *A lytle treatous or dyaloge very necessary for all Christen men to learne and to knowe*. But a later edition, under the title *The true beliefe in Christe and his sacramentes, set forth in a Dialogue betwene a Christian father and his sonne*, printed by Walter Lynne, in 1550, has long been available in the libraries of this country; and it turns out on examination of the type, paper, and watermarks, to be merely a re-issue,* not a reprint, of the original sheets, with a fresh introduction to take the place of the old one—so that Lynne did little more than set his name upon merchandise that had been anonymously produced some twenty years before by the enterprising Johann Schott of Strasburg.

The *Short title Catalogue* . . . of Messrs Pollard and Redgrave still ignores the Vienna copy of 1527, the first edition of this book. It gives "*The true belief* . . ., 1550, in that *omnium gatherum* section headed "Jesus Christ" (p. 327).

* This has been made quite clear by Mr. Robert Steele in the above-quoted article of the *Transactions of the Bibliog. Society* and in a postscript to the article of S. H. Scott on "The Schotts of Strassburg and their Press" (*ibid.*). Mr. W. A. Shaw in his *D.N.B.* article on William Roy, 1897 (where unfortunately other bibliographical data do not appear to be as reliable), had already recalled the Vienna discovery, and accurately described the 1550 volume as the re-issue.

FURTHER RESEARCH ON *A HUNDRETH SUNDRIE FLOWRES*

BY B. M. WARD

THOSE who read my Introduction to the reprint of *A Hundreth Sundrie Flowres* * may remember that I reached three main conclusions :

- (a) That the book was an anthology, and only in part by Gascoigne.
- (b) That Christopher Hatton was the largest anonymous contributor, his pseudonym, or "posy," being "Fortunatus Infelix," or "Master F. I."
- (c) That, both Gascoigne and Hatton being abroad at the time it came out—the former certainly, the latter probably—the Earl of Oxford was the editor who arranged the publication, he himself contributing sixteen lyrics signed with the posy "Meritum petere grave."

It may also be remembered that the "hundreth" poems are preceded by two letters, one signed H. W. and the other G. T. Hazlitt was the first to suggest that these initials might stand for Henry Wotton and George Turbervile. Nothing whatever appears to be known about Henry Wotton except that he came of a Norfolk family and that in 1578 he published a book called *A Courtlie Controversy*.† George Turbervile, on the other hand, was a well-known poet and writer who published several books between 1567 and 1575. He must have been acquainted with George Gascoigne, for they were at the Inns of Court together.

In the absence of definite information, however, I was led to believe that these two letters were not by Wotton and Turbervile, but that they were a device employed by the anonymous editor, whose soubriquet "Meritum petere grave" appears on the title

* Etchells and Macdonald, 1926. Reviewed in *R.E.S.* III. No. 9, p. 111. Cf. also *The Library*, December 1926, p. 269; and June 1927, p. 123.

† B.M. 12611. cc. 15.

page. As there is reason to suppose that this was the posy used by Lord Oxford in signing his poems, I concluded that he himself had composed the letters as a blind to conceal his identity. But Dr. Greg has justly pointed out in *The Library** that if G. T.'s letter is an editorial invention designed with the set purpose of mystification, the evidential value of his statement that the poems are by "sundrie gentlemen" is seriously weakened; and in consequence he sees no reason to doubt Gascoigne's word three years later when he claimed all the poems as his own.

Since then I have discovered fresh evidence that has led me to modify my original views, and incidentally to meet Dr. Greg's objection. This evidence, in brief, is that Hatton and Turberville were intimately acquainted with each other, and that they were both abroad in 1573—the former from June till about September, and the latter probably from before January till about August. This circumstance, taken in conjunction with the fact that G. T. and F. I. of the *Flowres* were evidently friends, makes it likely that George Turberville was the author of the letter signed G. T. It is the purpose of this article

- (a) To prove that Hatton and Turberville were friends; thus confirming the avowed friendship of G. T. for F. I.
- (b) To prove that Hatton and Turberville were at Antwerp together in 1573, thus giving H. W. his chance to publish the book.

It will therefore be seen that the result of my recent investigations has been to strengthen the credibility of the statement made by G. T. in the *Flowres*, viz., that the poems are by several authors, among them his friend F. I.; and to discredit the evidence of George Gascoigne, who, in his *Posies* of 1576, claimed that he himself was the sole author of the book.

1. *The Letters of H. W. and G. T.*

A brief recapitulation of the two letters which explain how *A Hundreth Sundrie Flowres* was prepared for publication will first be desirable. On August 10, 1572, G. T. wrote a letter to his friend H. W. In this letter he says that at H. W.'s request he is sending him the manuscripts of

a number of Sonets, layes, letters, Ballades, Rondlets, verlayes and verses, the works of your friend and myne Master F. I. and divers others.

* December 1926, p. 274.

He goes on to ask H. W. not to show them to any one else, and to return him the manuscripts when he has read them, and impresses on him the necessity for secrecy. But H. W. proved faithless to this trust. Having got the poems he set about arranging for their publication,

contrary to the chardge of my said friend G. T.

The reason he gives is that

if the aucthors onely repyne, and the number of other learned mindes be thankfull, I may then boast to have gained a bushell of good will in exchange for one pynt of peevish choler.

He has, he adds, decided to christen the book *A Hundreth Sundrie Flowres*. All this we are told in a letter headed "H. W. to the Reader" which is printed together with G. T.'s letter in the volume. This letter of H. W. is dated January 20, 1572/3, and it must have been fairly soon after this that *A Hundreth Sundrie Flowres* appeared in print.*

2. George Turberville.

It will only be possible here to go into the life of George Turberville very briefly. The following table gives a summary of his actions and movements so far as they are known :

1565-1567	Publishes three books ; <i>The Eglogs</i> . . . ; <i>Epitaphs epigrams</i> . . . ; and <i>The Heroycal Epistles</i> . . .
1568	Publishes <i>A Plain Path to Perfect Vertue</i> . . .
1568, June	Accompanies Thomas Randolph on his embassy to Russia.
1569, Autumn	Returns from Russia.
1571, March 19th	Deprived, by order of the Privy Council, of his charge of the levies in Dorset.
1574 ?	Publishes <i>Tragical Tales</i> . . .
1575	Publishes the <i>Book of Faulconrie</i> . . . †

Although Turberville may have lived on until the seventeenth century we need not here go further than 1575, which covers the

* Cf. *A Hundreth Sundrie Flowres*, cit. pp. 7-11.

† I have taken the order and dates of these six books published by Turberville from an article in *Modern Philology* (Chicago), vol. 15 (1917-1918), by Professor Hyder E. Rollins, entitled *New facts about George Turberville*. Professor Rollins shows that his first book—*The Eglogs*—cannot have appeared before 1565 ; and his last—the *Book of Faulconrie*—is known to be 1575. He conjectures 1574 for the *Tragical Tales* because it must have come out before the *Book of Faulconrie* ; but the earliest edition we possess is 1587. There is another book—*The Noble Arte of Venerie or Hunting*—which came out in 1575. It is universally attributed to Turberville, but does not bear his name on the title page.

date of the publication of *A Hundreth Sundrie Flowres*. The facts given above are all that are known about him at this period, but I shall deal presently with certain new items that have only just come to light.

3. *A Seditious Book.*

In January, 1572-1573, a book came out called,

A treatise/of Treasons/against Q. Elizabeth and the Croune of England/
diuided into two Partes:/whereof/The first Parte answereth certaine/
Treasons pretended, that never were/intended:/And the second dis-
covereth greater/Treasons "comitted, that are by few/perceived: as
more largely appeareth in the Page folowing/Imprinted in the moneth/
of Ianuarie and in the Yeare/of our Lord/MDLXXII.*

It was published at Antwerp by J. Foulcr,† but bore no author's name on the title page. It consists of 174 pages and is divided into two parts:

The first part confuteth the false accusations and slanderous infamies printed in certain nameless and Infamous libels against the Q. Majesty of Scotland, heir apparent to the Croune of England: and against Thomas Duke of Norfolk Earl Marshall of the same Realm.

The second part is a venomous attack on Lord Burghley and Sir Nicholas Bacon, who are styled the "English Catilines":

Of these two men and of none other am I to be understanden in the Treatise, when I use any terms that may seeme to touche Authoritie: . . . that whatsoever impugneth their private purpose (the end whereof I verily beleve your Q. seeth not) must be taken and published for traitorous, seditious, sclaunderous, rebellious, and whatsoever els can be thought more odious.‡

They are accused of plotting the death of both Elizabeth and the Queen of Scots, and so to bring

the Croune immaturrely to the thirde House of Suffolke.§ Consider how the Captaine Catiline || of this conjuration now linketh himselfe with y^e Noblest and Auncientest of your Nobilite (least in credit I meane) how

* B.M. C. 12. c. 16.

† This does not appear in either of the two copies in the British Museum, but is stated without query in *A Short Title Catalogue of English Books*, by Pollard and Redgrave (1926), p. 169.

‡ Sig. a8.

§ Sig. a3, p. 107. The claim of the "House of Suffolk" was vested in Edward Seymour, Lord Beauchamp, who was descended from Lady Mary Tudor, the sister of Henry VIII. and wife of Charles Brandon, Duke of Suffolk.

|| *I.e.*, Burghley.

strong thereby he maketh himselfe, and what a partie he and his familie with their adherence.*

This is a reference to the marriage in December, 1571, of Anne Cecil, Burghley's eldest daughter, to Edward de Vere, the seventeenth Earl of Oxford and Lord Great Chamberlain. He was then twenty-one and a great favourite with the Queen; and the importance of his capture by the Burghley faction was fully recognised by the Lord Treasurer's opponents.

How this book came to England is told in the manuscripts at Hatfield House.† We read that a copy of it was delivered by an unknown man at the house of Alexander Nowell, the Dean of St. Paul's. A covering letter was signed "Tom Truth" and dated at Calais August 4, 1573. The Dean, being "much troubled," handed it over to Sir Ralph Sadler, a staunch adherent of Burghley's. Sadler, finding it "most false, lewd and seditious," sent it on August 24 to Sir Nicholas Bacon, with the remark that he wished he could send the author as well. Bacon sent it next day to Burghley, asking him to show it to the Queen. Burghley apparently first consulted the Archbishop of Canterbury, who returned the "mad book" as he called it on September 11, giving as his opinion that it was not worthy an answer. But Burghley was evidently of another mind, for on September 28 the Queen issued the following proclamation:

Certain traitors, unable to openly harm their country, are printing books in English, Latin, and other strange languages; wherein, under cover of promoting the Queen's safety, they make charge of treason against two of her most devoted subjects. No persons are to regard these seditious slanders, but the books should be handed over to the Privy Council. ‡

Here for the moment the matter ended.

4. *George Turberville and the "Treatise of Treasons."*

Another copy of the *Treatise of Treasons* exists in the library of the Archbishop of Canterbury at Lambeth Palace.§ This copy has, however, bound up with it two additional items not to be found in either of the copies in the British Museum. The first item consists

* P. 128.

† Historical MSS. Commission. Cecil MSS, vol. ii. pp. 55 *et seq.*

‡ *Catalogue of Tudor and Stuart Proclamations* (1910), vol. i. p. 74.

§ XXX, 8, 16 (4). It is not shown in the *Short Title Catalogue*.

of twenty-four printed pages, and is really a précis or index to the *Treatise*. It is called

A Table/gathered/owt of a booke named/A treatise of treasons against Q. Elizabeth/and the Croune of England. latelie com-/piled by a stranger and sent owt/of France, Printed in the/yeare of our Lord/1572.*

Then follows a dedication to the Queen, which I give in full below :

The didicatory epistle to her heighnes.

Madam, this table of treasons doth your heighnes to wit of a booke called, *A treatise of treasons against you and the Croune of England*. That treatise is addressed of grateful affection borne to yow, and discovereth hidden treasons, which reach to the danger of your person, of your state and life. That treatise discovereth the transposing of the crowne, the extingting of your line, and the hazarding of the Realme. It openeth unto yow the contrivers of those treasons to be a couple of companions of base parents borne : first callid to Court, thone from the booke, thother from the buttery : which two be now more then Barones by office and dignitie, more then Earles by possessions and wealth, more then Dukes in authoritie : which two be now your cosening Counsaillors, though sette uppe by your good favour in the chiefest places of the Realme, whereby they have made themselves mightie in money, marriages and allies, and be the two captain conspiratours, that have in their owne power and in the hands of their confederates, all the offices, all the portes, all the fortresses, your treasour, your armour, yea your selfe, your succession and the whole realme to dispose at their will : They be the two captaine conspiratours that have beset yow rownde abowte with feares, and dangers prepared by themselves and by sondrie fine devices removed from yow all defenses of faithfull friendes at home and abroad, devided the realme into factions, abused your authoritie, imploied your treasours to the danger of your state, to the infamie of your person, and to your final overthrow by death or deprivation ere it be long.

Thus that treatise discovereth those two traiterous Counsaillours who to work more subtilly their mischievous intentions, and to kepe yow from espying their terrible treasons, have misleaden yow by a false show of other treasons, wich were never intended, and abused yow undre title of dutie, pretence of service, and colour of securitie to hold them unsuspected.

In that treatise also your heighnes shal see the unbuckling and lifting upp of their visards and veiles, that wold walk unseene, and still covertlie circumvent yow by their fine fetches whiles they freelie finish their determined treasons against your person and state.

That treatise of treasons is abridged into this table, which showeth forth but in brieve maner, what in the same is at full enlarged.

* This date (1572) refers to the *Treatise* which was printed in January 1572-1573, and not to the *Table*.

It is therefore passing necessarye, that having good regarde of your owne person, the preservation of the realme and the rightfull succession of the same, yow call for that treatise, yow read that treatise, as wel for the more full and better understanding of the conspiratours practises finallie ment : as for their mischievous meanes used to bring the practises to passe. And it is more then high time to understand the impudent falsehood, the fatall malice, the desperate devises of the conspiratours against your line, your life and succession if by speedie meanes and good advice, they be not prevented.

The author of the treatise, and the abridged of the same beare good affection to yow and to the realme : and therefore do discover unto yow the present perills that now hang over both ; which when yow shal by surview perceave and understand, God give yow grace, to consider and prevent.

And Madam for that it cannot be doubted but that those two Conspiratours doe watchfullie care and politickly provide, how to kepe from yow al letters, bookes and treatises, which they feare may let or discover their final purpose : It hath ben thought necessarie to invent and find owt all good meanes whereby the said treatise or at least the Table of the same, might by some more faithful servant of yours, be addressed to your owne handes : for the which respect it hath bene by meanes conveyed to the sight of your trustie servant Mr. Hatton (and others) who of dewtie and alleageance hath bene thought the most fitt instrument to present yow the same. Wherein he shal show your heighnes, more love dutie and faithful obedience, then those of your Counsaillours, that so many monethes sithence, have had the treatise itselke in their handes and concealed the same, either of doubt their practises might be untimely discovered and prevented, or indeede for lack of love towards your heighnes person ; which standeth in greater perill then yow can believe. God geve yow grace to forsee and avoide the same.

Your heighnes dailie Orator

G. T.

I would draw the reader's attention to the signature of this dedication :

Your heighnes dailie Orator

G. T.

Now, the use of the word " orator " in subscribing a dedication is, as far as I know, unique, except in the case of one author, George Turberville. The word is, of course, common enough in petitions and other legal documents ; but I have never come across it in any book dedication, save, as I have said, in the case of Turberville.*

* " Ile bee your daily Orator " occurs in the burlesque dedication of Thomas Nashe's *Strange Newes*, 1592. Its use there seems, however, hardly to affect the present argument [Ed. R.E.S.].

In five out of his six signed books the dedications conclude as follows :

- (a) *The Eglogs* . . . (1567) dedicated to his uncle Hugh Bamfild :
Your nephewe and daylie Orator
GEORGE TURBERVILLE.
- (b) *The Heroycal Epistles* . . . (1567) dedicated to Thomas Howard,
Lord Bindon :
Your humble Orator
G. TURBERVILLE.
- (c) *Epitaphs, epigrams* . . . (1567) dedicated to the Countess of
Warwick :
Your ladiships daily Orator
GEORGE TURBERVILLE.
- (d) *A plain path to perfect virtue* . . . (1568) dedicated to Lady
Warwick :
To whom I rest a dayly Orator
GEORGE TURBERVILLE.
- (e) *The Booke of Faulconrie* . . . (1575) dedicated to the Earl of
Warwick :
your Honours most bounden Orator
GEORGE TURBERVILLE.

In his sixth book—*Tragical Tales*—the word "Orator" is not used in the subscription of the dedication ; but this may be accounted for by the fact that the dedicatee was his brother Nicholas Turberville. The foregoing reiterations of the word "Orator" seem to make it fairly certain that the G. T. who wrote this dedication to the Queen was George Turberville the poet.*

Bearing this in mind let us turn to the second additional item which is to be found in the volume in the Lambeth Library.

5. Christopher Hatton and the "Treatise of Treasons."

This second item is a printed copy of a letter. It follows immediately after the "Table gathered owt of a booke" and with it the volume concludes. I give it in full below :

* It may, perhaps, be mentioned that although we have no definite evidence as to the attitude of the poet on the religious and succession questions, there is no doubt that the Turbervilles were notoriously a Catholic family (cf. *D.N.B.* article, Turberville, James ; Cal. S.P. Dom. Eliz., August 4, 1581, and October 10, 1586 ; and Professor Rollins's article (p. 527) already quoted). It is therefore quite natural to find George Turberville ranged on the side of the Catholics and the Queen of Scots.

A Copie of a lettre addressed from Antwerp the xxvi of Iune to Mr. Hatton and delivered unto him at Spaw the 5. of Iulie 1573.

Sir, yow maie not finde strange sith God hath geven to eche man a charge and care of his Neighbour (as it is in holie writ) if some one that wissheth yow well do geve this adventure in few lines to put yow in remembrance of God, your soule, your prince and countrey. The first being mattré that ought to be most deere unto yow, is most to be considered: as that yow were first baptized in the faith Catholique, your continuance for manie yeres therein, and the danger in forsaking the same: the weight whereof no worldlie treasures or dignities can countervaille: the one being eternall, the other temporall, brittle and fraile, as over manie of your condition have tried, finding their experience powdered with bitter repentance. But your naturall good indication giveth forth better hope that yow will in time embrace the best, whereunto it seemeth God moveth yow by laying his heavie hand lovinglie uppon yow, that yow might for errors past, endeavour timely satisfaction; and thereto hath brought yow to a safe porte, if yow list therein to repose and quiete yourselfe where doubtlesse yow shal finde more trew comfort and peace of conscience, then if yow would (delighting still in vanities) retourn againe to the place that floweth and abondeth with the tempestes of worldlie temptations.

And for that yow be known to be in the good favour and grace of your Prince and to tendre mattres that appertaine to her securitie, and would what in yow lieth advance to her knowledge, whatsoever threatneth her perill, her state and the cutting of, the rightful Succession of the same: as also to be readie to minstre her the occasion whereby her heighnes may in time repaire the dishonors and infamies procured by such as she accompanied her most faithful subjectes, this inclosed being a table of Treasons collected owt of a booke latelie come owt of France is addressed unto yow, that yow should thereof make speedie conveye, in sort that the same may not faile to passe directlie to her heighnes handes in the dutie whereof it is hoped you will not faile, for that it is firder intended that the said Table shal also be consigned to others of your qualities, and shortlie come to print, and be published so, as both her heighnes and the world may be witnes that some one that loveth her and wanteth other readie meanes for the conveye thereof, hath by laying the same upon yow and others, discharged his band and dutie in that respect. Thus wisshing yow as much grace and comfort as to myselfe, doe heartilie recomend yow to the mercies of Almighty God. From Antwerp, the 26 of June 1573.

By yours to his power

G. T.

Now, in May 1573, Hatton seems to have been seriously ill. On the 23rd of that month Gilbert Talbot wrote to the Earl of Shrewsbury, his father, that

Mr. Hatton, by reason of his great sickness, is minded to go to the Spa for the better recovery of his health.

His warrant "to pass over the seas for recovery of his health" was signed by the Privy Council on the 29th. He took leave of the Queen on June 5, and on the 17th wrote to her from Antwerp.* He wrote two other letters to her, one on August 10 but without giving the place, and the other without either date or place. Sir Harris Nicolas conjectures that both these were written from Spa. He was back in England by October 11, for on that date a Puritan fanatic named Peter Byrchet attempted to assassinate him in London. The attempt miscarried because Byrchet mistook Sir John Hawkins for his intended victim. In his confession Byrchet stated that

he deemed it a matter of conscience to assassinate [him] because he had made himself obnoxious to the Puritans, by whom he was considered 'a wilful papist, and hindereth the glory of God so much as in him lieth.' †

I shall have more to say about this attempted murder later on.

Let us now consider the essential facts of the case in their chronological order :

- | | |
|-----------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1572, Jan. to June | Trial, conviction, and execution of the Duke of Norfolk. On January 20 he wrote to his son Philip : " Mr. Hatton is a marvellous constant friend, and one that I have been much beholden unto." † |
| 1572, March | George Gascoigne goes as a volunteer to the Low Countries, where he remains till November, 1574. |
| 1572, June to Dec. | The <i>Treatise of Treasons</i> written in defence of the Duke of Norfolk and the Queen of Scots. § |
| 1572, 10th Aug. | G. T. hands over the manuscripts of <i>A Hundreth Sundrie Flowres</i> to H. W. |
| 1573, Jan. | Publication of the <i>Treatise of Treasons</i> at Antwerp. |
| 1573, after Jan. 20th | <i>A Hundreth Sundrie Flowres</i> published by H. W. against G. T.'s wishes. |
| 1573 June | Christopher Hatton and G. T. are both at Antwerp. |
| 1573, 26th June | G. T. writes a letter to Hatton, who has now gone on to Spa. He encloses his abridged version of the <i>Treatise</i> in his letter. |
| 1573, 4th Aug. | The <i>Treatise</i> is sent anonymously from Calais to the Dean of St. Paul's. |

* Nicolas, *Life and Times of Sir Christopher Hatton*, pp. 22 *et seq.* ; and Cal. S.P. Dom. Eliz., 1547-1580, pp. 461 and 462.

† Nicolas, *op. cit.* p. 31.

‡ *Ibid.*, p. 9.

§ The book was in part, at any rate, written after Norfolk's death, because on p. 120 his execution is referred to.

- 1573, 24th Aug. The *Treatise* is read by Sir Ralph Sadler, Sir
to 11th Sept. Nicholas Bacon, Lord Burghley, and the
Archbishop of Canterbury.
- 1573, 28th Sept. The Queen, in a proclamation, pronounces the
book to be a slander, and orders all copies
of it to be handed over to the Privy Council.

These facts speak for themselves, and I think comment on them is unnecessary. The only point which may be considered doubtful is whether the Antwerp G. T. is identical with George Turbervile the poet. In view of the "daily Orator" argument, however, it would seem that this is probably the case.

6. *Two attempted assassinations.*

It is not known exactly when Hatton and Turbervile returned to England. But I have already mentioned that Hatton must have been in London on October 11, for on that date an abortive attempt was made to kill him. Now, it is a curious fact that just a fortnight before this a similar attempt had been made on the life of George Turbervile, the poet. As far as I know the document giving this information has never before been transcribed, so I give it in full below :

Pardon to George Turbervyle, gent, for acting in self defence. Whereas by an inquest taken at Blandford Forum, co. Dorset, 24th October 15 Eliz. [1573] before Richard Cheverell alias Frauncys, one of our Coroners in our said county, upon view of the body of Robert Jones there lying dead, it was found by the jurors that George Turbervyle of Winterbourne Whitchurch in the said county, gent, on the 26th of the preceding September, about the second hour of the afternoon, was walking along the Queen's highway between Blandford and Strickland, when at Brienston on the said road the said Robert Jones, filled with great hatred and malice, planning of malice aforethought to slay the said George on the said road, rode after him, and attacked him at Brienston aforesaid with a sword, with which he struck him several times, giving him a wound in the abdomen 3 inches deep, with intent to murder him. The said George fled from him as far as he could, and then gave him two mortal wounds (with a sword worth thirteen shillings) in his right arm—one an inch broad and four inches long, the other an inch broad and two inches across his arm ; of which wounds the said Robert died on the spot. And the jurors say that this he did in self defence and not otherwise. Therefore we have pardoned, and by these presents do pardon, the said George the suit of our peace which to us belongs against the said George, by reason of the death aforesaid.

Witness the Queen at Westminster, 16th November.*

* Patent Roll (Chancery) 15 Eliz. Part XII, Mem. 38 (Latin).

There can be little or no doubt that this refers to the poet. In the first place he belonged to the Winterbourne Whitchurch branch of the family. In the second place Professor Rollins has shown by internal evidence that the *Tragical Tales written by Turbervile in time of his troubles* must have been written *circa* 1574; surely we have now got the cause of his "troubles" which has not hitherto been known.

Let us for a moment consider these two attempted murders. There is nothing on the face of it to show that there is any connexion between them, save that they took place within a fortnight of each other. In the case of Turbervile there is no reason given for the attack, but this is due to the fact that dead men tell no tales. With Hatton it is different. Byrchet confessed, and there is no reason to doubt him, that he intended to kill Hatton because he was "a wilful papist." This is rather curious. Unless we knew of G. T.'s letter to him, he is the last man one would have expected to have roused the ire of the Puritans. It may, perhaps, be argued that Byrchet was a lunatic who acted on the impulse of the moment. But this does not seem to have been the case, for Sir Thomas Smith, writing to Lord Burghley on October 15, 1573, says:

It is said here that divers times within this fortnight, both by words and writings, Mr. Hatton hath been admonished to take heed to himself, for his life was laid in wait for.*

So that just at the time Turbervile's life was being attempted, there were rumours that Hatton was being threatened in the same way.

We can now complete our chronological table of facts:

- 1573, 26th Sept. Attempted assassination of George Turbervile.
- 1573, 28th Sept. The Queen's proclamation against the *Treatise of Treasons*.
- 1573, 11th Oct. Attempted assassination of Christopher Hatton.
- 1575, 7th Jan. Lord Oxford leaves England for the Continent, where he is travelling till April 1576.
- 1576, Jan. While Oxford is on the Continent a new edition of *A Hundreth Sundrie Flowres* is brought out by Gascoigne, in which all trace of G. T. is carefully expunged, and the patently untrue statement is made that G. T.'s story called the *Adventures of Master F. I.* is really an innocent translation from Bartello's Fable of Ferdinando Jeronimy.†

* Nicolas, *op. cit.* p. 31.

† Cf. *A Hundreth Sundrie Flowres*. Cit. pp. xxv and 187.

Surely the facts in these two chronological tables cannot all be imaginary coincidences ?

7. Conclusion.

I think it will be agreed that the existence of a fairly intimate friendship between Hatton and Turberville—or at any rate the individual who signed himself G. T.—has been definitely established. The bearing that this has on the problem of *A Hundreth Sundrie Flowres* will readily be seen. The identification of Hatton as the poet "Fortunatus Infelix" or "Master F. I." of the *Flowres* rests on the contemporary evidence of Gabriel Harvey.* There is a good presumptive case for supposing that the initials G. T. stand for George Turberville. It is natural to find a poet interested in poetry, and it was G. T. who collected the manuscripts of the poems from his friends George Gascoigne and "Master F. I." The friendship avowed by G. T. for F. I. has been paralleled in real life. Finally, we know that G. T. was strongly averse to having the manuscripts published ; and we now know that Turberville—or G. T.—was almost certainly abroad when his false friend H. W., to whom he had entrusted his collection probably before leaving England, broke his word and had them printed.

Up to now the two great pillars supporting the all-Gascoigne authorship of *A Hundreth Sundrie Flowres* have been :

- (a) The assumption that Gascoigne was speaking the truth when he claimed the book as his own.
- (b) The assumption that the letter of G. T. in the *Flowres* is a fraudulent composition, and therefore unreliable evidentially.

Do the facts in the case sustain these assumptions ? I venture to suggest that they emphatically contradict them :

- (a) Gascoigne stands convicted of at least one glaring lie. This is his absurd statement that the *Adventures of Master F. I.* in the *Flowres* is really a translation from an Italian "riding tale" by Bartello called the *Fable of Ferdinando Jeronimy*.†

* See *A Hundreth Sundrie Flowres*. Cit. p. xi ; and *The Library*, December 1926, pp. 276-278.

† Cf. *Flowres*. Cit. xxxv and 187. It may be added that no writer of the name of Bartello exists ; if Bandello is meant I challenge any one to produce a "riding tale" of his called the *Fable of Ferdinando Jeronimy*.

- (b) Arguments have been advanced in this article to show that there is a high degree of probability that the letter of G. T. in the *Flowres* is a genuine document, penned by a real man, George Turberville the poet.

Old beliefs die hard, and I do not doubt that there is still plenty of vigour in the belief of the all-Gascoigne authorship of *A Hundreth Sundrie Flowres*. On the other hand, there may be a few who will agree with me that there really *is* a mystery behind the *Flowres*—which I hold to be the first Elizabethan anthology—and the *Posies of George Gascoigne*, which is worth unravelling. To these I would suggest that the mystery is the question of authorship. This riddle is not yet fully solved, but I suggest that Hatton and Turberville provide the clues with which we can at least make a start. In this article I have scarcely touched on the Earl of Oxford and G. T.'s friend H. W. These are questions about which I hope to be able to say something at a later date.

THE SOURCES OF THE RESTORATION HEROIC PLAY

BY WILLIAM S. CLARK

"THE heroic, or rhyming, plays were borrowed from the French, to whose genius they are better suited than to the British. . . . We have little doubt that the heroic tragedies were the legitimate offspring of the French romances of Calprenède and Scudéry."* In these words of a century ago Sir Walter Scott set forth the first important critical view of the sources of the Restoration heroic play. From his view scholars in recent years have largely dissented, and have stressed instead the development of the heroic play from the English drama of the pre-Restoration period. Professor J. W. Tupper in his introduction to the Belles Lettres edition of D'Avenant (1909) stated the modern view as follows : †

There are so many points of resemblance between the romantic plays of the early Stuarts and the heroic plays of the later Stuarts that the latter drama may be regarded as the legitimate development of the former.

Somewhat later Professor F. E. Schelling expressed the even more emphatic opinion that the ultra-romanticism of Beaumont and Fletcher "declined into its logical successor, the Restoration heroic drama." ‡ He has reiterated this opinion without modification in his recent book, entitled *Elizabethan Playwrights*.§ The same insistence upon the development of the Restoration form out of the work of earlier dramatists is to be found in Professor Allardyce Nicoll's discussion of the origins of the heroic play, wherein he remarks : ||

. . . The heroic play . . . is to be explained by a threefold formula—Elizabethan substratum, the spirit of the age, and foreign influence.

* *Works of Dryden* (Scott-Saintsbury Edit.), vol. ii, p. 317.

† P. xix.

§ Pp. 229, 270-271, 281.

‡ *The English Drama* (1914), p. 182.

|| *A Hist. of Rest. Drama*, pp. 82-84.

. . . The impossible platonic love, the conflict of passion and honour, the distant scenes of countries unknown or idealised, all these Beaumont and Fletcher handed on to their successors, D'Avenant, Dryden, and Orrery. . . . The hero of the Restoration tragedy is not the hero of the pure tragedies or tragi-comedies of romance; he moves in a world of greater grandeur, where bombast and rant take the place of clearer and more subdued poetic expression. This heightened atmosphere, this rant, this bombast, and this egotism, may well have been fostered by that other Elizabethan strain which took its rise in Marlowe's *Tamburlaine*.

Now it cannot be denied that there are "many points of resemblance between the romantic plays of the early Stuarts and the heroic plays of the later Stuarts," and strong similarities of language between the pre-Restoration drama in the Marlovian tradition and the heroic play of the later period. Nevertheless, it is by no means justifiable to conclude upon the basis of these likenesses alone that the Restoration type has derived its features directly from the older English drama. Fresh literary influences of great importance are to be discovered in the Restoration era, after two decades of political upheaval and almost complete theatrical inactivity. An historical study of sources for the heroic play tends to modify profoundly the conclusions to which a broad, critical survey of the serious drama before and after the interregnum might easily lead. Indeed, the more deeply the origins of the heroic play are probed from the historical point of view, the less significant these apparent connections with the romantic and the Marlovian streams of tradition appear.

Roger Boyle, Earl of Orrery, and John Dryden are now generally regarded as the two pioneers in the writing of the so-called "heroic play." Orrery's important contribution to the development of the heroic play as a regular Restoration dramatic type was his introduction of couplet rimed verse into the dialogue. This innovation was openly known as a borrowing of the prevailing French fashion. Then, in conscious imitation of Orrery's example especially, Dryden soon took up the heroic couplet for dramatic purposes.* These two poets quickly established the rimed couplet as one of the outstanding characteristics of the new heroic play.

Except for his innovation of the heroic couplet, Orrery played little part in the formation of those other features which characterised the heroic play in general. In plot, character, and atmosphere his plays were too ultra-French to invite any appreciable imitation by

* For evidence on these points see my article in *Mod. Lang. Notes*, vol. xlii, p. 16.

his contemporaries. Consequently a study of sources for the other important elements in the heroic play centres around the work of Dryden, who speedily became the recognised leader in the new species of dramatic composition. The great success of his first pieces paved the way for a numerous body of imitators, whose works, while of course individual to some degree, show no unusual departures from the standard features of the type as established and developed by Dryden. He is the dominating playwright both in the rise and in the fall of the heroic play.

Hence, in their attempts to locate the sources of inspiration which created the heroic play, interested students have been prone to turn first of all to Dryden's *Of Heroic Plays, An Essay* as an authoritative document on the subject, and to place far too great reliance upon its guidance. In this essay Dryden would fain give the impression that he had entered upon the composition of heroic plays with a pre-conceived, scholarly theory about the form which they were to assume. Among others, Mr. B. J. Pendlebury, in his *Dryden's Heroic Plays* (1923), has accepted without question this impression as the fact. He goes so far as to state that the ideas expressed in the essay constitute a "critical recipe" which Dryden had formulated before he actually began to write his heroic plays. The most significant conclusion to be drawn from *Of Heroic Plays, An Essay* is, he believes, "the extraordinarily conscious manner in which he (*i.e.* Dryden) seems to have tried to concoct a type of drama by the deliberate selection and combination of various literary elements, according to his critical recipe."* Yet, surely, the widely varying structure and characteristics of Dryden's five heroic plays are apparent to the casual reader even, and are a sufficient evidence in themselves that these plays were not methodically constructed along the basic lines of a predetermined "critical recipe." They certainly cannot be said to demonstrate the orderly development of a fixed dramatic type according to an unchangeable set of critical ideas which was in the mind of the author from the beginning. On the contrary, they are separate, creative efforts, moulded by varying influences and whims at the moment of creation. The striking individuality which exists among the group is the most convincing proof that Dryden neither began nor carried on the writing of them with his eye upon any pre-conceived dramatic formula to which he must adhere.

* P. 70.

The "critical recipe," which can be derived from Dryden's statements in *Of Heroic Plays, An Essay*, doubtless is in large measure a product of meditation upon his dramatic achievements, past and present. He had in mind certain critical ideas regarding the heroic play, as will later be shown, previous to the composition of the essay, but that occasion demanded of him for the first time the clear-cut formulation of a critical theory to lend the proper scholarly air to his account of the rise of the heroic play. Dryden intended the essay to be a preface to the text of *The Conquest of Granada*, which was still very much in the limelight at the time it was printed in 1672. On the one hand, the piece had been a tremendous success in the theatre; on the other, it had been heartily condemned by certain prominent wits and poets of the city. By the end of 1671 the famous burlesque, entitled *The Rehearsal*, directed especially against Dryden's latest creation, had become the "hit" of London, and had aroused in some quarters strong ridicule of Dryden and his type of heroic play. Although Dryden himself was more than satisfied with his accomplishment, still at the same time he chafed under the attacks of his critics and was anxious to vindicate himself and his play in print. In view of these historical circumstances his statements in the essay should not be taken at face value without careful investigation. They seem unquestionably to be strongly coloured by consideration of *The Conquest of Granada*, which was occupying so much of his thought during the composition of the essay that about one-half of the latter is devoted to a spirited defence of particular matters chiefly concerned with that play. Therefore, although the critical theory outlined in his essay may have developed in part somewhat previously, all indications point to the probability that it took final form only as a result of the writing of *The Conquest of Granada*. The latter appeared, as Dryden now viewed it, to have assumed, as far as the drama could, the essential features of an heroic poem. So close a resemblance he had now achieved in this heroic play that he was inspired to construct the ingenious exposition of critical development set forth in *Of Heroic Plays, An Essay*. This exposition would explain and justify the present form of his heroic play, exemplified by the severely attacked *Conquest of Granada*. Through the claim that the heroic poem originally suggested the main characteristics for the heroic play, Dryden aimed to secure the authority of the epic as a sanction for the various features in his pieces of this type, especially *The Conquest of Granada*. The spirit

and purpose of the latter half of the essay, frankly those of defence for his most recent success, give weight to the belief that the whole treatise was composed largely with the same intention. Of course, the presence of such an intention casts over the contents of the essay a strong shadow of suspicion as to the historical accuracy of the statements. In view of these considerations, *Of Heroic Plays, An Essay* should be regarded as by no means a trustworthy account of their origins and of their development. Dryden himself certainly had no thought that he was composing a scholarly dissertation on the subject. In this essay, as elsewhere, he was writing for popular consumption. His primary purpose was to attract the interest and win the support of the literary-minded folk about town, not to satisfy the meticulous requirements for exactness of modern critical scholarship.

In regard to *Of Heroic Plays, An Essay*, there is one further point of particular interest which has hitherto had little attention. The argument of the essay follows a course which clearly evidences that Dryden shaped its outline in the light of the prefatory matter to D'Avenant's *Gondibert* (1651). In his remarks concerning the intimate relationship between the heroic poem and the heroic play Dryden has indicated that he had given careful consideration to the critical views expressed by his predecessor in the poet-laureateship. These views, set forth in the *Preface to Gondibert*, were the first complete and thoughtful treatise exclusively on the heroic poem to be published in English. Dryden naturally turned, therefore, to D'Avenant's writings as the most prominent English exposition on heroic poetry, one which was undoubtedly familiar to all the more learned among his readers. During that part of his essay wherein he discussed the nature and features of an heroic poem, Dryden has shown so close an observance of the points and the language in D'Avenant's preface that it almost seems as if he had had a copy lying open before him while he was writing. Space will not permit the citation here of the considerable borrowings or paraphrasings of thought and figures of speech from the *Preface to Gondibert*, but even a hasty reading will convince any sceptic. That later portion of Dryden's discussion, in which he undertakes to argue for the propriety of the appearances of supernatural beings and of magical phenomena in heroic poetry, has seemed to at least one authority an actual digression.* On the contrary, it appears a most natural

* *Essays of Dryden*, edit. by W. P. Ker (Oxford, 1900), vol. i, p. lvi.

extension of the argument if the trend of Dryden's thinking at the time of composition be truly understood. He took up the question because D'Avenant in his preface had expressed his opinion with some emphasis, and then Cowley in his commendatory verses prefixed to *Gondibert* had set forth his position on the subject with great prominence. Dryden, out of self-defence for his own practice, which diverged almost completely from their ideas, was quite naturally impelled in the course of his essay to give his grounds for such a striking disagreement with their views on this much-mooted critical question of that day. All in all, Dryden occupies a half of the general discussion on heroic plays with arguments over points connected with the heroic poem, raised by the introductory contributions to *Gondibert* of D'Avenant and Cowley. The evident influence of these writings upon the outline of remarks in *Of Heroic Plays*, *An Essay* has been almost completely overlooked up to the present time.

Early in his essay Dryden observed that the first outlines of that type of drama, known as the heroic play, appeared in D'Avenant's opera, *The Siege of Rhodes* (1) 1656; (2) 1661. Too much significance has often been attached to this statement. It should be remembered that D'Avenant and his writings, as already explained, were occupying a foremost position in Dryden's thought when he was composing his treatise. Now D'Avenant from such evidence as is to-day available appears to have been the author of the term, "heroic play," which first is to be discovered in print in the dedicatory preface to *The Siege of Rhodes* (1663). Furthermore, D'Avenant there used the term to denote that species of drama of which he seemingly considered his own operatic piece a specimen. Thus D'Avenant himself originated the idea that *The Siege of Rhodes* represented in its general characteristics the form of an heroic play. Dryden therefore might well have been led to assign to *The Siege of Rhodes* the pioneer position in his account of the birth of the heroic play through the direct suggestion of D'Avenant's previous remarks concerning the piece. If so, Dryden's statement should not be taken as positive proof of an original indebtedness on his part to *The Siege of Rhodes* in the construction of his first heroic play. Yet, when he set out to mould a new type of serious drama with which he might please his age, he surely must have turned to the contemporary stage for possible hints. *The Siege of Rhodes* would logically have attracted his especial notice, since, during the years

1661-1663, it was not only the single Restoration example of serious dramatic expression, but also a tremendously popular piece with the theatre-going crowd. Dryden could perceive from its reception that the elements of gorgeous scenery, stirring action, martial story, warrior heroes, and the gallant motivations of love and honour delighted the tastes of the audience. Certainly the particular directions which any pleasing innovations should take were at least pointed out to him as a result of D'Avenant's creation.

Dryden's pioneer effort, in collaboration with Sir Robert Howard, resulted in a romantic-historical play of martial endeavour, entitled *The Indian Queen*. Whence Dryden and Howard drew the specific material on which the play is based has not hitherto been ascertained, but seemingly conclusive evidence exists that the French heroic romance, *Polexandre*, by Gomberville, afforded the main source of suggestion. The romances of Gomberville, *La Calprenède*, and *Madeleine de Scudéry* had begun to penetrate English literary circles before the middle of the century. In 1647 an English translation of Gomberville's *Polexandre* came out in London. The first part of *La Calprenède's Cléopâtre* appeared in London during 1652 under the title of *Hymen's Præludia* or *Love's Masterpiece*. In the same year a translation of Scudéry's *Ibrahim* was published, while the following year saw her *Artamène ou Le Grand Cyrus* "Englished by F. G. Esq." The demand for this type of literature had by now grown so great that Roger Boyle, Earl of Orrery, was led to write and publish in 1654, *Parthenissa*, the first English imitation of the French heroic romance. The popularity of such works continued to increase during the years preceding the Restoration. A most striking indication of the veritable rage for this sort of reading is an advertisement appended to an edition of Lodowick Carliell's *Two New Plays*, printed by Humphrey Moseley in 1657. Eighteen romances, chiefly of French origin, are listed as translated into English, among the more important of which are *Cassandra*, *Clelia*, *Cleopatra*, *Polexander*, *Artamenes*, *Ibrahim*, *Astrea*. By the time of the Restoration these vast and vapid French romances provided the most delectable portion of the literary fare upon which the average English reader subsisted. It is not strange, therefore, that, just as in Elizabethan times, so once again at the Restoration, the dramatists thought to find in the popular prose fiction of the day the readiest and surest suggestion for plot and characters that would best suit the tastes of their audience.

The general theme of Peruvian and Mexican history in the early sixteenth century, which underlies both *The Indian Queen* and its sequel, *The Indian Emperor*, was apparently inspired by a long and prominent digression from the main story to be found in the very early pages of *Polexander*. This digression, entitled *The History of Zelmatida, Heir to the Empire of the Incas*,* offered to Dryden and Howard most of the historical elements utilised in *The Indian Queen*, though they have often employed their borrowings with great freedom. For example, Montezuma in *The Indian Queen* is the invincible general of the Peruvian Inca, who later goes over to the side of the Mexicans; whereas in the romance Montezuma is the absent Emperor of Mexico. The figure corresponding to the general of *The Indian Queen* is Zelmatida, the Peruvian prince, who, after battling in his father's behalf against certain Mexican armies and winning glorious victories, later becomes leader of the Mexicans in their war against the rebellious Indians.† The absolutely unhistorical interweaving of the affairs of the Mexicans and the Peruvians, which is carried out in the romance, has, however, been followed at length in *The Indian Queen*. The conception of Zempoalla, the usurping Indian queen, as the ruler of Mexico at the opening of the play, may well be based upon the fact that the story of Zelmatida in *Polexander* sets forth as the ruler of Mexico, *ad interim*, Queen Hismalita, whose general Zelmatida for a time becomes,‡ just as Montezuma in *The Indian Queen* acts in the same capacity for Zempoalla during a brief space. The name of Zempoalla is derived from the province, Zempoallan, mentioned in the romance as a tributary state to Mexico.§ The appellation of Zempoalla's general, Traxalla, is also formed from the name of an Indian tribe who rebelled against the Mexicans, the Traxallans || (or Taxallans, as Dryden mistakenly calls them in the *Connection of the Indian Emperor to The Indian Queen*). Garucca, the faithful servant of Zelmatida in *Polexander*,¶ is the same character transferred to be the faithful guard of Amexia, the exiled but lawful Queen of Mexico, in *The Indian Queen*. The material for the sacrifice scene at the altar in the Temple of the Sun (Act v, Sc. i.) was supplied by any one of several descriptions of similar scenes which appear in the course of Zelmatida's history. Perhaps the most interesting

* Eng. trans. (London, 1647), pt. i, bks. 2-4.

† Eng. trans. (1647), pt. i, p. 65 ff.

‡ *Ibid.*, p. 65.

† *Ibid.*, pt. i, p. 40 ff.

§ *Ibid.*, p. 63.

¶ *Ibid.*, p. 36.

borrowing, however, comes from another part of *Polexander*. The conjurer, Ismeron, who comes to the fore during the third act of *The Indian Queen*, is the exact prototype of Habul Ismeron, the Moroccan magician, who is introduced in Part III. of the French romance.* The incantation scene at Ismeron's cell is little more than the dramatisation of a similar occasion in *Polexander* where an occult demonstration with closely resembling details takes place in the magician's cave.

From other of the French romances the variety of situation and incident in *The Indian Queen*, and also in *The Indian Emperor*, was largely reproduced. In a little-known monograph, *La Calprenède's Romances and the Restoration Drama*,† Mr. H. W. Hill has made an interesting and detailed comparison between the plots of *The Indian Queen* and *The Indian Emperor*, and those of *Cassandra* and *Cleopatra*, and has clearly demonstrated that the situations and events in the two plays are for the most part derived from La Calprenède's inventions. *The Indian Queen* contains twenty-one type situations and incidents, of which sixteen occur in *Cassandra* and *Cleopatra*, while the remaining five very closely parallel certain ones either in *Cassandra* or *Cleopatra*, or in both. Twenty-two type situations and incidents are to be found in *The Indian Emperor*; seventeen copy those in one or both of the two romances with the other five nearly identical to such devices in the French works. Although most of the incidents and situations which Dryden and Howard, or Dryden alone, utilise are, of course, to be located also in other than these two of the French romances, as Mr. Hill suggests, the first scene in Act iv. of *The Indian Queen*, where Zempoalla and Traxalla come to the prison and protect Montezuma and Orazia respectively from each other's attacks, appears certainly as a direct imitation of an occurrence unique to *Cassandra*.‡ Those incidents or situations which do not exactly follow the models of La Calprenède, meticulous search would very probably show to be drawn from the works of Gomberville or Scudéry.

The Indian Queen reveals borrowings from these same French sources in the "variety of characters" also. The evil woman, Zempoalla; the generous rival, Acacis; the unscrupulous rival,

* Eng. trans. (1647), pt. iii, p. 27 ff.

† Chicago, 1911. Reprinted from Univ. of Nevada Studies, vol. ii, No. 2; vol. iii, No. 2.

‡ *La Calprenède's Romances and the Rest. Drama*, p. 64.

Traxalla ; the obdurate ruler, rival to the hero for the heart of the heroine, the Inca of Peru ; the sweet, lovely, and innocent heroine, Orazia ; all these personages, whose counterparts were subsequently introduced into *The Indian Emperor*, have their originals in the romances, for example, of La Calprenède.* Montezuma, the hero of both plays, bears considerable resemblance in traits and in conduct to Artaban, the hero of *Cleopatra*, though it is in the hero of *The Conquest of Granada*, Almanzor, that Dryden finally copies in detail the figure of Artaban. This last imitation he has partially admitted in *Of Heroic Plays, An Essay*,† but he was too intent on producing the impression of classical scholarship to admit fully his borrowing from contemporary sources, and therefore attributed to Homer and Tasso the chief suggestions for Almanzor's character. Indeed, Dryden rather gives away the whole secret by his further statement that, "where I have designed the patterns of exact virtues, such as in this play (*i.e. The Conquest of Granada*) are the parts of Almahide, of Ozmyn and Benzaida, I may safely challenge the best of theirs (*i.e. of the French*)." Since his purpose in the essay was to vindicate himself, and hence to avoid any revelations which might expose him to the charge of imitation of modern writers, the borrowing implied by this statement arouses a suspicion that Dryden proceeded considerably farther in his copying than he would have his readers think. In view of the circumstances, this veiled admission of imitation constitutes in itself alone strong evidence for a belief in Dryden's conscious and extensive plagiarism from the romances of La Calprenède and his compatriots, not only in the case of *The Conquest of Granada*, but also of the earlier plays.

The atmosphere in which the characters of *The Indian Queen* and of *The Indian Emperor* move, one which is universal to all the heroic plays, is pervaded by the sentiments of love and honour as motives for action—sometimes conflicting motives. The conflict between love and honour, however, is not so strongly displayed in these two pieces as in the later heroic plays. Indeed, on only one occasion does the conflict between the two sentiments assume large proportions as a factor in the development of the plot.‡ Now to any one who has actually delved into the French heroic romances it must be at once obvious that such an atmosphere of gallant sentiment was as

* *La Calprenède's Romances and the Rest. Drama*, pp. 75-81.

† *Works of Dryden* (Scott-Saintsbury edit.), vol. iv, p. 26.

‡ *The Indian Emperor*, Act iv. Sc. 2 ; *Works* (Scott-Saintsbury edit.), vol. ii, pp. 376 ff.

directly transposed as were historical themes, situations, incidents, and characters, from the pages of these works of fiction where love and honour flourish with a luxuriance far exceeding that which they attained in the less extravagant romantic creations of the late sixteenth century. The atmosphere and mood, which the French romances infused in their offspring from the first, cannot better be described than in the words of the *Address to the Reader*, prefixed to the English translation of *Le Grand Cyrus* in 1653 :

If you ask what the subject is : 'Tis the Height of Prowess, intermixed with Virtuous and Heroick Love, consequently the language Lofty, and becoming the Grandeur of the Illustrious Personages that speak ; so far from the least sully of what may be thought vain or Fulsome, that there is not anything to provoke a Blush from the most modest Virgin ; while Love and Honour are in a Seeming Contention, Which shall best instruct the willing ear with most Delight.

Closely related to the sentimental atmosphere is that characteristic of the heroic play which Professor Nicoll and a host of other dramatic historians stress as a prominent, fundamental feature, and an important link with the earlier English drama of the Tamburlaine line, namely, the ranting tone and bombastic language of the characters, of the hero particularly. In *The Indian Queen* and *The Indian Emperor*, however, the tone of the speeches is exalted only to the same degree as that which is common to the language of the persons in the French heroic romances. As the already quoted *Address to the Reader* of *The Grand Cyrus* has stated, the language of the heroic men and women in these interminable novels was "lofty and becoming the illustrious personages that speak." In the beginning Dryden plainly did no more than reproduce the lofty tone of men of high prowess, fired with virtuous and heroic passion, such as he had originally observed in La Calprenède, Scudéry, or Gomberville. Not until the composition of *Tyrannic Love*, which followed about four years after *The Indian Emperor*, does the tendency to fashion the language of the heroes in an inflated and ranting style appear—a tendency which came to full fruition in the absurd grandeur and extravagance of the speeches in *The Conquest of Granada*. Montezuma, Dryden's first hero, speaks in a phrasing and a tone far removed from those of his highly-glorified successor, Almanzor. His case alone renders unsound any assumption that fiery extravagance and ridiculous bombast were an original element in Dryden's heroic play, wherein he had harked back to the Tambur-

laine tradition. On the contrary, although the seeds of these characteristics were implanted in his borrowings from the French heroic romances, they clearly did not reach the stage of actual development until later, when another important literary influence had had an opportunity to affect Dryden's thought and imagination.

This influence was none other than that of the heroic poem, the vogue of which arose somewhat subsequent to that of the heroic romances, which, by the way, George de Scudéry in the preface to his heroic poem, *Alaric*, calls epics in prose. Between 1650 and 1660 at least six important heroic poems by prominent writers appeared in France.* Of course, D'Avenant's *Gondibert* (1651), written in Paris, was an early result of the renewed interest in, and discussion of epic poetry across the Channel. This growing wave of admiration for the heroic poem as a literary type swept over into England, and gradually came to have its effect upon Dryden, as the course of his critical remarks demonstrates. In *An Essay of Dramatic Poesy* (c. 1666) Dryden followed in the steps of Aristotle and regarded the two forms of poetry, tragedy and epic, as of one genus with the same style of language and verse consequently proper for both. Nevertheless he considered tragedy superior as a poetic type, because its method of discourse is nearest to that of human life.† The *Preface to Tyrannic Love* (1670) showed, however, that Dryden's thought concerning the relationship between tragedy, as exemplified by the heroic play, and the heroic poem had undergone a change. He still considered them identical in nature, but he now proceeded to justify features in the former by reason of the fact that they were allowable in the latter. He wrote in the *Preface* the significant statement that "these heroic representations, which are of the same nature with the epic, are not limited, but with the extremest bounds of what is credible."‡ The heroic poem had evidently usurped the position of pre-eminence, formerly accorded to tragedy, and had indeed become the norm by which he intended to develop his particular species of tragedy, the heroic play. Only an increasingly admiring attention to the epic form, stimulated by the wave of popularity which it was then enjoying in the literary world, appears likely to have produced that marked change in attitude.

Such a shift in Dryden's critical view would seem to be the main

* Lemoyne's *Saint Louis*, Saint-Amant's *Moyse Sauvé*, Godeau's *Saint Paul*, Scudéry's *Alaric*, Chapelain's *La Pucelle*, Desmarets de St. Sorlin's *Clovis*.

† *Works* (Scott-Sainsbury edit.), vol. xv, p. 369 ff.

‡ *Ibid.*, vol. iii, p. 381.

cause which led him to instil a more noticeable, strained loftiness into the dialogue of *Tyrannic Love*, that it might thereby attain a closer resemblance to the style of heroic poetry as he then conceived it. He himself was quite conscious of an intent to heighten the language, since he remarked in the *Prologue* :

Poets like lovers should be bold and dare,
Hence 'tis, our poet, in his conjuring,
Allowed his fancy the full scope and swing.
But when a tyrant for his theme he had,
He loosed the reins, and bid his muse run mad.

The prompting to allow "full scope and swing" to his fancy, in the speeches of Maximin especially, may be traced therefore to Dryden's growing belief that the discourse of the heroic play should possess the same extreme majesty of tone with which the heroic poem in his opinion was already endowed by tradition and practice.

When Dryden discovered that the intended imitation of pseudo-epic language in *Tyrannic Love* highly pleased the tastes of the audience, he proceeded to its more intensive employment in the *Conquest of Granada*. Even greater bombast and more widespread extravagance in the dialogue resulted from this final development of his aim to transpose the supposed grandeur of epic speech to the drama. His aim found its complete critical expression in *Of Heroic Plays, An Essay* (1672), where he stated : *

. . . An heroic play ought to be an imitation, in little, of an heroic poem . . . the laws of an heroic poem did not dispense with those of the other (*i.e.* of the drama), but raised them to a greater height. . . . I have modelled my heroic plays by the rules of an heroic poem.

The contrast between these views and those in *An Essay of Dramatic Poesy* affords strong evidence that the later developments in the language of Dryden's heroic plays occurred hand in hand with the change in his critical conceptions regarding the relationship of that species of tragedy to the heroic poem.

This map of the literary material and influences out of which were largely moulded the chief elements in Dryden's heroic plays—the key group in that field of the Restoration drama—is admittedly sketchy ; but it has been plotted with the hope that, although the territory covered is by no means new, certain fresh sources may have been pointed out, and others, vaguely recognised for a long

* *Works* (Scott-Saintsbury), vol. iv, p. 21 ff.

time, more clearly emphasised. The rimed verse, in which these heroic plays were written, was introduced by the Earl of Orrery as a new dramatic fashion in frank imitation of the French mode. The historical theme, the names and types of the characters, the situations and incidents of the plots, the sentimental motives in the action, even the lofty love of the dialogue—all these were in the main derived from the contemporary French heroic romances. Finally, the extremely bombastic language, which was not an original characteristic of the species, but developed subsequently, was inspired by fresh critical ideas on Dryden's part, stimulated by the outburst of enthusiasm for the heroic poem, generated in France.

In the face of this extensive dependence upon French suggestions the resemblances between the heroic plays and the English drama of earlier periods come to have much less significance. Their features of similarity are mostly due to the common, conventional elements in the European prose romance from Elizabethan times onwards. Beaumont and Fletcher, whose drama has been felt by some scholars to be closely akin to the Restoration heroic drama, are known to have drawn heavily upon the Spanish romances of the day, as for example in *Philaster*, which is founded to a considerable extent upon an enlarged version of Montemayor's *Diana*.^{*} The French heroic romances of course contained, beside their own peculiar characteristics, the basic elements which had belonged as well to the older continental romances, of which *Diana* is a famous representative. Hence the English dramatists of both pre-Restoration and Restoration days, were bound to reproduce in their respective plays certain features which would bear at least a slight resemblance. It is these deceptive similarities which have led to the erroneous conclusion that the earlier drama directly influenced to a large degree the Restoration playwright. The view, therefore, that important organic connections exist between the heroic play and the plays of Beaumont and Fletcher, and of Marlowe, seems quite unwarranted. The Restoration type should not be called "the legitimate development" of older English work, because the latter was, in the light of the historical evidence, neither the vital source of inspiration nor the foundation for later innovations, such as this statement would imply.

Dryden and Orrery, of course, did not simply brush aside the English dramatic material which lay before them, and proceed in

^{*} *Publ. Mod. Lang. Assoc.*, vol. xli, pp. 294 ff.

their writing oblivious to its existence. That course would be unnatural and impossible for any dramatist on his native soil. They felt, to be sure, the background of the pre-Restoration drama, and they were conscious, no doubt, of its traditions and practices, which can in minor details be traced in their compositions. Yet in comparison to the clear, strong influences from alien sources, this substratum of past English dramatic production does not appear as a prominent, stimulating and impelling force. Whatever effect the pre-Restoration drama exerted upon their work was to a great extent cumulative, not directive. Their heroic plays mark a distinct break with the past, though perhaps not an utter disregard of it. After all, the view of Sir Walter Scott a century ago, which has long been abandoned as too extreme, is shown by this hasty survey to be fundamentally correct. The heroic plays are, more than anything else, "the legitimate offspring of the French romances."

Nevertheless, this is not to say, as has one authority, that the Restoration heroic play was "frankly introduced as a foreign thing to please a Frenchified court." * Nothing was further from the thought of Dryden and his followers than the intention to introduce a French creation as such! Can one imagine the author of *An Essay of Dramatic Poesy*, the chief purpose of which was "to vindicate the honour of our English writers from the censure of those who unjustly prefer the French before them," frankly producing a French imitation? These dramatic poets possessed too much English pride as well as native talent, to bring forth a copy of any foreign form. They fused the materials drawn from various sources, mainly alien, with an originality in imagination and in expression which set upon their compositions the unmistakable national imprint. Although the Restoration heroic play was moulded largely by exotic influences, it was distinctly the unique product of English genius.

* L. N. Chase, *The English Heroic Play*, p. 193.

THE VIRGINS CHARACTER :

A NEW POEM BY PHILIP MASSINGER

BY A. K. MCILWRAITH

So little is known of Massinger's miscellaneous verse, and what we have is so severely "occasional" and uninspired, that it seems worth while to print the following rather pleasant poem, which was ascribed to him over a hundred years ago, but seems to have escaped the notice of the early editors and of all subsequent students.

The Virgins Character occupies folios 52^r to 54^r of Harleian MS. 6918, a commonplace book compiled by one Peter Calfe,* about the middle of the seventeenth century. *The Catalogue of the Harleian Manuscripts* (vol. iii. p. 448), published in 1808, doubtfully attributes the poem to "Peter Massinger"; I take this to be a mere slip for Philip Massinger, and am confident that the ascription is correct. The signature "P: M:" suggests it, and there are several characteristic echoes of the author's other works. With ll. 45-47 :

as Thetis foote, or Venus hand,
or that maiestically command
which graced olimpique Iuno . . .

compare the similar conjunction in *The Parliament of Loue* (MS. Dyce 39, fol. 5^v), ll. iii. 55-56 ; *Works* (Gifford, 1813), ii. 264 :

givinge yo^r Iunos ma^{ty}, Pallas witt
dianas hand & Thetis pritty foote.

With ll. 57-60 :

And yet that forme which tempts the eye
soe mixt with Saint like modesty,
that she at once might make old Nestor younge,
yet from loose accents charme a favourites tongue ;

* *The Catalogue of Harl. MSS.* (iii. 448) and Mr. L. C. Martin (Crashaw, *Poems* (Oxford, 1927), Intro., pp. lxxvi-lxxvii) distinguish between the hand of the concluding poems signed "P. C." and "that of the major portion of the MS." The MS. would appear, however, to be written in a single hand throughout, and that hand probably belonged either to Peter Calfe or to his amanuensis.

compare *The Picture* (1630, sig. C 1^v), I. ii. 59-60; *Works* (Gifford, 1813), iii. 128:

she hath a beauty
Would make old *Nestor* young.

With ll. 65-66:

sett soe exactly, as Art then did trye
to Ioyne with nature to make harmony;

compare the similar expression in *The unnaturall Combat* (1639, sig. G 3^v), III. iv. 16-17; *Works* (Gifford, 1813), i. 187:

secure me that your heart and tongue
Joyne to make up this harmonie

(where Gifford reads "Join to make harmony"). And with ll. 88-90:

she should with such proportion moue
as all should sweare, thus on fresh Idas greene
the Graces were ledd by the paphian Queene:

compare *The Parliament of Loue* (fol. 5^v), II. iii. 57-58; *Works* (Gifford, 1813), ii. 264 (lines immediately following those quoted above):

or when yo^e daunce to sweare that Venus leads
the graces so on the Idalian greene

(where Gifford curiously reads "The Loves and Graces from the Idalian green").

Finally in ll. 110-112:

soe apt to doe a Courtesy
as she esteemes that day quite past
in which none of her bounties taste,

the adaptation of Titus' *diem perdidit* (Suet. *Titus*, 8. 1) is used of its proper subject in *The Roman Actor* (1629, sig. B2^v), I. i. 83-87; *Works* (Gifford, 1813), ii. 335:

We had a *Titus*,
Stilde iustly the delight of all mankinde,
Who did esteeme that day lost in his life
In which some one or other tasted not
Of his magnificent bounties.

The poem is addressed (ll. 35-36) to "Kneuet's first daughter." In 1629 Massinger dedicated *The Roman Actor* "To my much Honoured, and most true Friends, Sir Philip Knyuet, Knight and Baronet. And to Sir Thomas Ieay, Knight. And Thomas Bellingham of Newtimber in Sussex Esquire." Sir Philip Knyvet of Buckenham, Norfolk, son of Sir Thomas Knyvet, Knt.

(† 1594), was created a baronet at the institution of the Order, May 22, 1611.* His eldest daughter was Dorothy, baptised at New Buckenham, September 15, 1611.† A second daughter, Katherine, was baptised there June 2, 1614,† and a third, Hellen, "having beene baptised by her mother, was receaved into the Church" at St. James, Clerkenwell, on July 5, 1618.‡ I have not been able to learn whom Dorothy Knyvet married nor when she died.

There is no external evidence as to the date of the poem, but several passages in it (*e.g.* ll. 31-42, 53-54, 133-136) suggest that Dorothy Knyvet was of a marriageable age but unmarried, so we may suppose it to be later than 1625; and if she enjoyed the perfections here attributed to her it is perhaps unlikely to be long after 1630.

I give the text exactly as it stands in the manuscript, except in l. 86, where the scribal error *maque* is corrected to *masque*.

The Virgins Character :

[fol. 52^r

Such as doe Trophies striue to raise
to others worth for after dayes,
should in themselves some touches haue
of what they would keepe from the graue,
Since they can neuer truely Iudge of light
who are depriued the power, and use of sight ;
yet tis allowd men may admire
that heigth they neuer can aspire,
and things deformd at distance loue
those rare parts which in faire ones moue;
The Sunne, the Starres, the Temples soe are seene,
and soe A Beggar may affect a Queene :
Let none thinke then I ouerdare
presuming to write what you are,
or what you doe deserue to bee
in my free thought held flattery,
Since Enuy dare not say you can inherite
one blessing that's Superiour to your meritt ;
for those perfections good, as great
which make a spotlesse maide compleate |
As high discent, a heauenly minde
in natures master peece confined,
soe meete in you, that it begets some doubt
which of the three with most grace sett you out ;
Yet whilst I write, deare muse, forbear

[5

[10

[15

[20

[fol. 52^r

[25

* F. Blomefield, *History of Norfolk* (1805), i. 404-5.

† G. E. C., *Complete Baronetage*, i. 24.

‡ *Harleian Society, Registers Series*, ix. 81.

all words not suiting a Chast Eare,
 it being fitt that I should bee
 when shee's the subiect, in thought free ;
 that shee who but to goodnes hath noe will,
 and liues euen ignorance it selfe in ill ; [30]
 And yet that noe Contention bee
 among the virgins which is shee,
 of whom with Iudgement, I conferre
 of vertues selfe this Character ;
 I doe professe I offer at thy shrine [35]
 Kneuts first daughter what is only thine ;
 If beauty then soe perfect made
 in limbe, and feature, noe dimme shade
 darkning the splendour, may call on
 mens loue with admiration, [40]
 make women Iudges, and they will consent
 in all they wish for, thou art Excellent ;
 And yet to sett thy praises forth
 I neede not borrow others worth,
 as Thetis foote, or Venus hand, [45]
 or that maiesticall command
 which graced olimpique Iuno at the feast
 when loue borne Hercules was first her ghest : |
 But these old flourishes layd by, [fol. 53'
 a stocke left by Antiquitie [50]
 to helpe Invention when tis weake
 or teach a muse borne Dumb to speake ;
 Ile only fancy what a maide should bee
 in all things good, and great and thou art shee :
 Ile haue her then of noble bloud, [55]
 and faire too must be understood ;
 And yet that forme which tempts the eye
 soe mixt with Saint like modesty,
 that she at once might make old nestor younge,
 yet from loose accents charme a favourites tongue ; [60]
 Then to this forme a voice soe cleare
 as should enchaunt all such as heare
 her well weighed words, which stay too long
 by her pronounc'd to grace a song
 sett soe exactly, as Art then did trye [65]
 to Ioyne with nature to make harmony ;
 And that her chast thoughts may bee knowne
 in forraigne parts as in her owne
 they should french dressings sometimes weare
 as she were borne, and bredd up there, [70]
 not as their Garbe shee lightly did affect
 but spake it as the English Dialect ;
 With her choice language her faire hand
 bee euer skillfull to commaund
 each string and stopp, that may consent [75]
 in her to grace the Instrument ;
 soe Lesbian Sappho could loues sharpe wounds ease
 and not alone her selfe, but others please : |
 In entertainment let her bee [fol. 53'
 from Courtshipp, and Rusticity [80]
 equally distant, not to flye,
 nor ouer fond of company,
 soe wheresoeuer she shall place her Sceane
 her actions shall obserue the golden meane :
 Or if invited to the court [85]

at some Grand ma[s]que, or Royall sport,
 there if tooke forth her skill to proue
 she should with such proportion moue
 as all should sweare, thus on fresh Idas greene
 the Graces were led by the paphian Queene : [90]
 These her exteriour parts thus showne,
 what she within is would be knowne,
 and there to right her would require
 A muse thrice purged with phæbus fire,
 and yet with his best aydes twere hard to finde [95]
 words worthy to expresse her heavenly minde ;
 yet as I may, though I shall wrong
 such softnesse in my rougher songe,
 I will goe on, and yet her store
 makes my imagination poore, [100]
 all her soules faculties being soe diuine,
 and purer farre then I can fancy mine :
 That heavenly minde is now my Theame,
 which nere thought ill once in a dreame, [105]
 nor nake'd ere cherishd one intent
 white Innocence could ere repent ;
 Vertue, and that in action, being still
 the ready objects of her power, and will ; |
 And as she nere did Iniury
 soe apt to doe a Courtesy [fol. 54^r
 as she esteemes that day quite past [110]
 in which none of her bounties taste ;
 one gracious looke from her, or kinde salute
 being a guift that needes noe attribute ;
 But now admire ! these parts that take [115]
 most virgins, and selfe louers make
 could nere teach her to lay aside
 humility to putt on pride ;
 yet still she so preserues her dignity
 that such as serue her thinke themselues most free ; [120]
 And to crowne all, Religion
 the Rocke she strongly builds upon,
 against all change a sure defence,
 and Rampire to her Innocence
 keepes her so firme in her race well begunne [125]
 that to the end with glory she must runne :
 Duty made up of reuerend feare,
 and loue to her that did her beare,
 with pious care to be knowne his
 whose liuing picture sure shee is [130]
 soe winns on both, that as they Ioy in her
 their Ioy before her owne shee doth preferre :
 Thrice blessed maide, but more blest hee
 that is markd out by destinye
 T'embrace thee with a lawfull flame, [135]
 and soe to Change thy virgin name ;
 well may Kings enuy him, and hee professe
 In her hee's circled with true happinesse.

P: M.

THE WELSH ELEMENT IN THE *POLYOLBION*: DRAYTON'S SOURCES

By I. GOURVITCH

ABBREVIATIONS AND BIBLIOGRAPHY

- C. Camden, *Britannia*, etc., 1586.
G.C. Camden, *Anglia, Hibernia, Normannica, Cambria* . . . *Giraldus Cambrensis*, etc., 1602.
G.M. Geoffrey of Monmouth, *Historia Britonum*, ed. by J. A. Giles, 1844.
H. Holland, *Britain*, etc., trans. and augmented by Holland, 1610.
H.C. Humphrey Llwyd, *The Historie of Cambria*, trans. by Llwyd and augmented by David Powel, 1584.
Hol. Holinshed, *Chronicles*.
M. Malory, *Arthur, King of Britain*, ed. by Prof. Rhys, 1909.
P. Drayton, *Polyolbion*.

AMONGST the most Herculean of tasks attempted in English literature was the *Polyolbion*. Undertaken by Michael Drayton in the full glow of Elizabethan patriotism consequent on the crushing annihilation of the Spanish menace, the work was intended to aggrandise the name of Britain, and to link with that immortal fame for its author. To accomplish his purpose, Drayton sought to do poetically what Leland, Camden, and others had partially achieved in prose; namely, to give an exhaustive account of his native land, county by county; and, as he pursued his imaginary itinerary, to set down anything of interest—topographic, historic, legendary, or otherwise—that might enhance his theme.

Of the thirty songs of the *Polyolbion*, nearly seven * are devoted to Wales. In these, Drayton made use of a number of sources, chosen as in the remaining songs because of their authoritative value in his day. Thus, the chorographic details he found mainly in Camden's *Britannia*, as translated and augmented by Philemon Holland, whose work, published in 1610, was more than probably seen by Drayton in manuscript form.† The legends of Arthur,‡

* P. Songs 4-10.

† From the First Song onwards, details to be found in the *Polyolbion* are given in Holland's version, but not in the Latin of Camden.

‡ P. I. 181-202, III. 395-406, IV. 245-322, VI. 269-274; H. pp. 194-196, 227-228; C. pp. 76-77, 103-104; G.M. VIII. 19, IX. and X., XI. 2.

Merlin,* and Sabrina † (The Severn) were partially given him by Holland and Camden, but for many details he turned to Geoffrey of Monmouth and Malory; those of Saint David ‡ and Saint Winifred § he drew from Holland's translation of Camden. For his account of the Salmon of the River Tivy he used Holland, Camden, or Giraldus,|| whilst of the life of the Beaver, he found nothing in Camden, merely a few suggestive lines in Holland, but a lengthy description in the Latin of Giraldus.¶ Besides these, Holinshed furnished him with occasional references to Anglo-Welsh history, as for example in his narrative of the martial deeds of English warriors in Song 18; but for the eulogy given in the Ninth Song** to the exploits of the British princes in Wales, he turned to a work of Humphrey Llwyd, *The Historie of Cambria*, translated into English by Llwyd, but corrected and augmented by David Powel, and published in 1584; finally, although Drayton certainly knew of Llwyd's *Letter to Ortelius* of 1568, giving a graphic historical and geographical account of Anglesea, he may have based his own version on that of Holland or Camden.††

In the former of these, Llwyd " (a paineful and a worthie searcher of Brytish antiquities) translated into English, and partlie augmented, chiefly out of Matthew Paris, and Nicholas Trivet," ‡‡ the work of Caradoc of Lancarvan, who " collected the successions and actes of the Brytish Princes after Cadwalader to the yeare of Christ 1156." †† Copies of this were added to by monks in various abbeys of Conway and Stratflur, bringing the history to the year 1270, " a little before the death of the last Llewelyn." †† Llwyd died before his work was published, and Sir Henry Sidney, Lord President of Wales, who possessed the translation, later asked Powel " to peruse, and correct it, in such sort as it might be committed to the presse."

* P. IV. 322-348, V. 156-174, X. 14-37; C. pp. 119-120, 371; H. pp. 253-254, 649; G.M. VI. 17, 18, VII., VIII. 10, 11, 12; M. IV. 1.

† P. VI. 130-178; C. p. 381; H. p. 661; these two give origin of name only. G.M. has legend in full: II. 2, 3, 4, 5.

‡ P. IV. 220-230; C. pp. 358-359; H. p. 631.

§ P. X. 124-164; C. p. 394; H. p. 680; referred to also in G.C. II. 10. Annot. 4, by Powell.

|| P. VI. 45-55; C. pp. 377-378; H. p. 654; G.C. II. 3. Drayton probably used Holland, whose translation of Camden incorporates a phrase from Giraldus, that is echoed by the *Polyolbion*.

¶ P. VI. 57-85; H. p. 657, describes appearance of beaver, and adds: " Concerning the subtil wilnesse of which creatures, the said Giraldus hath observed many things." G.C. II. 3.

** P. IX. 190-370.

†† H. pp. 54-55, 671-673; C. pp. 526-528.

‡‡ H.C., " To the Reader," Powel.

Powel set about his task with diffidence and care. He compared Llwyd's translation with a better copy of the original and the works of numerous authorities, of whom he mentions no less than twenty-five by name; * after which he adds, in his preface, "I also had the Brytish books of petegrees, I. Castoreus, and Sylvester Giral. Cambrensis . . . received from . . . Lord Burghley, high treasurer of England, who also directed me by his letter to all the offices where the Records of this realme are kept, out of which I have gathered a great part of this historie."

It is clear that Drayton could hardly have gleaned from a more fertile field; yet he has devoted scarcely two hundred lines in all to the heroic accomplishments of Welsh princes, although the original comprises some four hundred pages. The glorification of the Welsh is placed in the mouth of Mount Snowdon and recounted to extend and emulate the praise given the Britons by the River Severn in Song 8. Drayton selected those names and features that would serve his purpose, carefully introducing them between episodes associated with the names of Cadwallader and Llewelyn ap Griffith, so as to lend apparent completeness to the whole. Incidentally, with a mere mention of the Laws of Howel (ll. 272-273), he omits altogether a period of 157 years, from 880 to 1037. Drayton's lines nevertheless have definite value: they call attention in graphic and concise manner to just those events in which the Welsh princes were able either to overcome their Saxon, Danish, and Norman foes, or to offer stubborn and spirited resistance; in addition, the narrative, brief as it is, includes the reputed voyage of Madoc to the New World and the creation of the infant child of Edward I. as Prince of Wales.

The method adopted by Drayton in poetising the facts selected, incorporating a phrase here and there that had caught his eye in a rapid reading of his original, will be shown by a comparison of the passages in question, giving alternately one from Llwyd's *Historie of Cambria* and one from the *Polyolbion*:

1. Cadwalader . . . by extreame plague of death and famine, was driven to forsake this his Realme . . . and to sojourne with a great

* Gildas, Asser Meneuensis, Galfride, William of Newborow, Matthew Paris, Matthew Westminster, Thomas Walsingham, Ponticus Virunnius, Polydor Virgil, Jo. Leland, Jo. Bale, I. Prise, Matthew Parker, Jo. Caius, William Lambert, Gildas Sapiens alias Nennius, Henrie Huntington, William Malmsbury, Marianus Scotus, Ralph Cogshall, Jo. Eversden, Nicholas Trivet, Florentius Vigorniensis, Simon of Durham, and Roger Hovedon.

number of his nobles and subjects with his cousin Alan, king of Little Brytaine. Little Brytaine is a countrie in France, called in Cæsars time Armorica, and after inhabited by Brytaines, who about the yeare of Christ 384, under the conduct of Conan, Lord of Meriadoc, now Denbighland, went out of this Ile with Maximus the tyrant, to his aid against the Emperour Gratianus, and winning the said countrie of Armorica (which Maximus gave Conan and his people) slue and drave out all the old inhabitants thereof, planting themselves in the same, where they to this daie speake the Brytish tong. H.C., pp. 1-2.

After a few introductory lines, the *Polyolbion* has :

Till with the term of Welsh, the English now embase
The nobler Britons name, that well-near was destroy'd
With pestilence and war, which this great isle annoy'd ;
Cadwallader that drave to the Armorick shore :
To which, dread Conan, lord of Denbigh, long before,
His countrymen from hence auspiciously convey'd :
Whose noble feats in war, and never-failing aid,
Got Maximus (at length) the victory in Gaul,
Upon the Roman powers. Where, after Gratian's fall,
Armorica to them the valiant victor gave :
Where Conan their great lord, as full of courage, drave
The Celts out of their seats, and did their room supply
With people still from hence ; which of our colony
Was Little Britain call'd.

P. IX. 190-203.

2. After he had prepared and made readie his navie for the transporting of his owne men, with such succours as he had found at Alans hand, an Angell appeared unto him in a vision and declared that it was the will of God that he should not take his voyage towards Brytaine, but to Rome . . . and be afterwards numbred among the blessed, for God had appointed that the Brytaines should have no more rule and governance of the whole Ile, untill the prophesie of Merlin Ambrose should be fulfilled.

H.C. p. 3.

. . . Some hold that this was signified to him in a dreame : of the which mind is Polydore Virgil.

P. 4.

Where that distressed king,

Cadwallader, himself awhile recomforting
With hope of Alan's aid (which there did him detain)
Forewarned was in dreams, that of the Britons reign
A sempiternal end the angry pow'rs decreed,
A recluse life in Rome injoining him to lead.

P. 203-208.

3. After that Cadwalader had taken his journeie towards Rome, as before is declared, leaving his sonne named Edwal . . . with his cousin Alan, which Alan . . . manned his ships . . . and appointed Ivor his sonne, and Ynyr his nephew to be leaders and chieftaines of the same, who sailing over the narrow seas, landed in the west parts of Brytaine . . . and Ivor wan the countries of Cornewall, Devonshire, and Somersetshire, and inhabited them with Brytaines.

This Ivor is he whom the English Chronicles do call Ive or Iew King of West Saxons.

H.C. pp. 7-8.

The king resigning all, his son young Edwal left
 With Alan : who, much griev'd the prince should be bereft
 Of Britain's ancient right, rigg'd his unconquer'd fleet ;
 And as the generals then, for such an army meet,
 His nephew Ivor chose, and Hiner for his pheer ;
 Two most undaunted spirits. These valiant Britons were
 The first who West-sex won.

P. 209-215.

Drayton, in his haste, has applied the term *nephew* to Ivor instead of to Hiner. However, a note to the word *West-sex* stating, "The West-saxons country, comprehending Devonshire, Somerset, and their adjacents," brings the text of the Song closer to the original.

4. Adelred king of Wessex raised a great armie . . . Roderike with the Brytaines gave him battell. . . . The yeare after, the Brytaines obtained two other victories against the Saxons : one in Northwales, at a place called Garth Maelawc and another in Southwales at Pencoeat.

H.C. p. 14.

. . . they purpos'd to restore
 His son young Rodorick, whom the Saxon pow'rs pursu'd :
 But he, who at his home here scorn'd to be subdu'd,
 With Aldred (that on Wales his strong invasion brought)
 Garthmalack, and Pencoyd (those famous battels) fought,
 That North and South-wales sing, on the West-sexians won.

P. 218-223.

5. The yeare following, died Celredus, king of Mertia, and Ethelbaldus was made king after him, who . . . entred into Wales . . . came to the mountaine Carno, not farre from Abergevenny, where a sore battell was fought betweene him and the Brytaines in the yeare 728.

H.C. pp. 14-15.

Scarce this victorious talk his bloody'd sword had done,
 But at Mount Carno met the Mercians, and with wounds
 Made Ethelbald to feel his trespass on our bounds ;

P. 224-226.

6. A great Battell . . . betwixt the Brytaines and the Pictes . . . where Dalargan king of the Pictes was slaine.

H.C. p. 16.

Prevail'd against the Pict, before our force that flew ;
 And in a valiant fight their king Dalargan slew.

P. 225-226.

7. The men of Southwales destroied a great part of Mercia with fire and sword. And the summer following, all the Welshmen gathered themselves together, and entred the kingdome of Mercia, and did much hurt there. . . . Whereupon Offa king of Mercia caused a great ditch to be made, large and deepe from sea to sea. . . . And this ditch is to be seene in manie places as yet, and is called. . . . Offas ditch at this daie.

H.C. pp. 18-19.

Nor Conan's * courage less, nor less prevail'd in ought
 Renowned Rodorick's heir, who with the English fought
 The Herefordian field ; as Ruthland's † red with gore :

* Conan is mentioned in H.C. on p. 17, and further.

† The battle at Ruthland occurs on p. 20.

Who, to transfer the war from his native shore,
 Marcht through the Mercian towns with his revengeful blade :
 And on the English there such mighty havock made,
 That Offa (when he saw his countries go to wrack)
 From bick'ring with his folk, to keep us Britons back,
 Cast up that mighty mound of eighty * miles in length
 Athwart from sea to sea. Which of the Mercians strength
 A witness tho' it stand, and Offa's name does bear,
 Our courage was the cause why first he cut it there :

P. 229-240.

8. After that, there was a great battell fought at a place called Gavelford, betwixt the Brytaines, and the West Saxons of Devonshire, and manie thousands cruellie slaine upon either side, and the victorie uncertaine.

H.C. p. 25.

As that most dreadful day at Gavelford can tell,
 Where under either's sword so many thousands fell
 With intermixed blood, that neither knew their own ;
 Nor which went victor thence, unto this day is known.

P. 241-244.

9. . . . The battell of Kettell betwixt Burchred king of Mertia, and the Brytaines : whertin, as some do write, Mervyn Vrwch king of the Brytaines was slaine.

H.C. pp. 27-28.

Nor Kettle's conflict then, less martial courage show'd,
 Where valiant Mervin met the Mercians, and bestow'd
 His nobler British blood on Burthred's recreant flight.

P. 245-247.

10. Of " Roderike . . . sonne to Mervyn," . . . H.C. p. 28.
 He had great warre with Burchred, king of Mertia. p. 28.
 This yeare also was the battell of Gweythen betwixt the Brytaines
 and the Englishmen. p. 32.
 When the Danes had thus abjured England, they bent their force
 against Wales, . . . where Roderike gave them two battells. p. 34.
 There was a great battell fought by the Danes, and the Englishmen
 of Mercia, against the Welshmen upon the river Conway, where the
 Welshmen had the victorie, and this was called the revenge of the
 death of Roderike. p. 38.

As Rodorick his great son, his father following right,
 Bare not the Saxons scorns, his Britons to out-brave ;
 At Gwythen, but again to Burthred battel gave ;
 Twice driving out the Dane when he invasion brought.
 Whose no less valiant son, again at Conway fought
 With Danes and Mercians mixt, and on their hateful head
 Down-showr'd their dire revenge whom they had murdered.

P. 248-254.

It is after this passage that, but for a mere reference to the Laws of Howel in lines 272-273, Drayton completely omits the period of

* Of Offa's Ditch, Camden has, " A Devae ostio usque ad Vagae 90 plus minus mill. pass. duxit." C. p. 354. Holland, p. 623, states : " Cast from Dee-mouth unto Wymouth . . . for the space of fourescore and ten miles." Drayton has apparently borrowed Holland's " forescore " and passed over the following words ; but the phrase *from sea to sea* he has taken bodily from Llwyd.

157 years, from 880 to 1037. Sixty pages of *Llwyd* are thus set aside before we read :

11. In the first yeare of his government he fought with the Englishmen and Danes at Crosford upon Seaverne, and put them to flight.

H.C. p. 90.

Gruffyth king or prince of Wales . . . gathered his power to revenge the often wrongs, which he had received at the Englishmens hands. . . . Therefore he . . . entred Herefordshire and spoiled all the waie with fire and sword, to the citie, whither all the people had fled, and they . . . gave him battell, which Gruffyth wished for above anie other thing, as he that had wonne five set fields . . . and after a great slaughter returned home with manie worthie prisoners, great triumph, and rich spoiles.

p. 99.

And, were't not that of us the English would report
(Abusing of our tongue in most malicious sort
As often-times they do) that more than any, we
(The Welsh, as they us term) love glorify'd to be,
Here could I else recount the slaughter'd Saxons gore,
Our swords at Crossford spilt on Severn's wand'ring shore ;
And Griffith here produce, Lewellin's valiant son
(May we believe our Bards) who five pitcht battels won ;
And to revenge the wrongs the envious English wrought,
His well-train'd martial troops into the marches brought
As far as Wor'ster walls : nor thence did he retire,
Till Powse lay well-near spent in our revengeful fire ;
As Hereford lay waste : and from their plenteous soils,
Brought back with him to Wales his prisoners and his spoils. P. 255-268.

12. . . . for God had brought in the Normanes to revenge his anger upon the Angles and Saxons.

H.C. p. 116.

And when all-powerful fate had brought to pass again,
That as the Saxons erst did from the Britons win ;
Upon them so (at last) the Normans coming in,
Took from those tyrants here, what treach'rously they got, P. 274-277.

The following seven lines of the *Polyolbion* refer to the stout resistance offered by the Welsh to William the Conqueror, without touching on any incident in particular ; this impression would certainly be gathered from the many pages in *Llwyd* devoted to William in Wales. Then Drayton once more reverts closely to his text :

13. Then William Rufus . . . entered Wales at Mountgomery, . . . but the Welshmen kept to the straites of the mountaines with the woods and the rivers, that the king did no good, but lost his labour and his men : therefore he returned backe to his great dishonor.

H.C. pp. 152-153.

And when in his revenge, proud Rufus hither came,
With vows us to subvert ; with slaughter and with shame,
O'er Severn him we sent, to gather stronger aid. P. 285-287.

Dealing with the Welsh resisting Henry I., Llwyd and Drayton have in turn :

14. Among these one drew his bowe and . . . by fortune stroke the king a great blow upon the breast, but by meane of his mize the arrow hurt him not. H.C. p. 185.

And through our rugged straits when he so rudely prest,
Had not his proved mail eate surely to his breast,
A skilful British hand his life had him bereft,
As his stern brother's heart, by Tirril's hand was cleft.

P. 291-294.

Then of Owen Gwyneth, etc. :

15. In the first viage of King Henric against the Welshmen, he was put in great danger of his life . . . not far from Flynt, where Henric of Essex, whose office by inheritance was to beare the standard of England, cast downe the same and fled. H.C. p. 207.

And let the English thus, which vilify our name,
If it their greatness please, report unto our shame
The soil our Gwyneth gave at Flint's so deadly fight,
To Maud * the empress' son, that there he put to flight;
And from the English power th'imperial ensign took.

P. 295-299.

16. I find also written by divers, that in the assieging of a bridge, the king was in no small danger of his life : for one of the Welshmen, shooting directlie at him, had persed him through the bodie, if Hubert de S. Clere . . . (perceiving the arrow coming) had not thrust himselfe betwixt the king and the same arrow, whereby he saved his maister and died himselfe. H.C. p. 222.

As when that king again, his fortune to advance
Above his former soil, procur'd fresh pow'rs from France,
A surely-level'd shaft if Sent-Clear had not seen,
And in the very loose, not thrust himself between
His sovereign and the shaft, he our revenge had try'd :
Thus, to preserve the king, the noble subject dy'd.

P. 301-306.

17. Madoc another of Owen Gwyneth his sonnes left the land in contention betwixt his brethren, and prepared certain ships with men and munition, and sought adventures by seas, sailing West . . . he came to a land unknown. . . . This land must needs be some part of that countrie of which the Spaniardes affirme themselves to be the first finders . . . must needs be some part of Nova Hispania or Florida. Whereupon it is manifest, that that countrie was long before by Brytaines discovered, afore either Columbus or Americus Vesputius lead anie Spaniardes thither. H.C. pp. 227-228.

As Madock his brave son, may come the rest among,
Who, like the God-like race from which his grandsires sprong,
Whilst here his brothers tir'd in sad domestick strife,
On their unnatural breasts bent either's murtherous knife;

* The Empress Maud is mentioned by Llwyd in the course of his narrative, pp. 206-207.

This brave adventurous youth, in hot pursuit of fame,
 With such as his great spirit did with high deeds inflame,
 Put forth his well-rigg'd fleet to seek him foreign ground,
 And sailed west so long, until that world he found
 To christians then unknown (save this advent'rous crew)
 Long ere Columbus liv'd, or it Vespuccius knew;
 And put the now-nam'd Welsh on India's parched face,
 Unto the endless praise of Brute's renowned race,
 Ere the Iberian powers had toucht her long-sought bay,
 Or any ear had heard the sound of Florida.

P. 307-320.

18. And here I think it not unmeet to declare the cause why the Englishmen use to call the Welshmen Crogens, as a word of reproach or despite: but if they knew the beginning, they should find it contrarie. For in the viage that king Henrie the Second made against the Welshmen . . . a number of his men . . . would have passed Offas ditch at the castell of Crogen . . . were met withall, and a great number of them slaine, as appeareth by their graves there yet to be seene. . . .

H.C. pp. 257-258.

And with that Crogen's name let the English us disgrace;
 When there are to be seen, yet, in that ancient place
 From whence that name they fetch, their conquer'd grandsires graves:
 For which each ignorant sot, unjustly us depraves.

P. 321-324.

This brings us to the concluding forty lines of Snowdon's oration which treat of the death of "Lewellin, Griffith's son," the birth of Prince Edward, son of Edward Longshanks, at Carnarvon, the creation of the title of Prince of Wales, and the restoration of the Welsh line in Henry Tudor. These are all to be found in *Llwyd*.*

Whilst a few of the historical facts given by this paper are in Holinshed's *Chronicles*,† the majority will be sought there in vain; but they do exist without exception in the *Historie of Cambria*; hence, it is highly probable that Drayton made no use at all of Holinshed for any of the episodes in question. Emphasis is added to this point of view by the fact that the incident of Edward I.'s wife of presenting the Welsh with a prince born in their own land and unable to speak a word of English is strangely enough omitted by Holinshed,‡ but is contained in *Llwyd* and narrated at length by Drayton.

Brief as the passage is that the *Polyolbion* devotes to this period of Welsh history, it indicates the extensive field covered by the poet in the preparation of the thirty songs in their entirety, of which the lines dealt with above are less than a seventieth part.

* Pp. 374, 376-377, 390.

† In particular, those relating to the struggles between the Normans and Welsh.

‡ Holinshed's statement reads: "And on S. Markes daie his sonne Edward, that after succeeded him in the kingdome, was borne at Carnarvan, where the king had builded a strong castell, and was come thither with the queene at that time, to see the same" (p. 282).

NOTES AND OBSERVATIONS

ACT-INTERVALS IN EARLY SHAKESPEAREAN PERFORMANCES

IN his reply to Sir Mark Hunter in *R.E.S.* for October 1927, Professor Dover Wilson argues that down to 1609 Shakespeare's plays were invariably acted without breaks, but that from the autumn of that year onwards, owing to the King's Men's occupation of the Blackfriars and their adoption of private-theatre routine, act-intervals were observed. As a corollary to this he also maintains that the good quartos (with one belated exception) are sound evidence for the methods of Shakespearean representation during the earlier period, and the Folio equally sound evidence for the methods followed in the later period. Hence, we are told that the prompt note at the end of the third act of *A Midsummer Night's Dream* in the Folio, "They sleep all the act," can only be taken as applying to the later period. Against that assumption I must protest. While there can be little doubt that the note was made some time after 1609, we are not accordingly warranted in concluding that there were no act-intervals at the Globe for the lovers to sleep through before that year. As it happens, I advanced rebutting evidence on that score some years ago in a published lecture dealing with a wholly different subject. Here is the passage :

Students of the First Folio will recall how, in the third act of the play, the Athenian lovers, wearied out by their fairy-driven game of cross purposes, lie down in the woods to rest, and, in a way possible only on the Elizabethan stage, remain sleeping in full sight of the audience throughout the brief act-interval, ultimately to waken early in the fourth act, when disturbed by the sound of the hunting horns. Now, it is a remarkable fact that at precisely the same juncture in *Histrionomastix* (i.e. between the third and fourth acts) we find a sustained travesty of this unique situation. While Mavortius and his train occupy the stage, Pride comes in with her three attendants, and "casts a mist" under cover of which the Mavortius

group disappear. Presently Mavortius and his satellites return "and fall asleepe on the stage." Envy enters amidst strains of music, and, blowing her breath upon them, "they all awake and begin the following Acte." Here we have burlesqued in due sequence the raising of the fog, the falling asleep, the sleeping in full sight right through the act-interval, and the awakening to the sound of music.*

Elizabethan scholars will hardly need to be reminded that the anonymous play, *Histrionastix, or the Player Whipt* was entered on the S.R. on October 31, 1610, and published very shortly afterwards, or that it was an old play dating assuredly from before 1598, and had been to some considerable extent rewritten and topicalised by Marston.† It is generally agreed that this revision took place before the close of the sixteenth century, but it will suffice now, I think, to point out that Marston ceased writing for the theatre on the collapse of the Blackfriars boys in 1608, and (as Mr. R. E. Brettell has recently shown in this Review) was ordained priest at Oxford in December 1609.

W. J. LAWRENCE.

NOTES ON CHARLES HOPKINS' *BOADICEA*

AMONG the neglected and almost forgotten dramatists of the Restoration is Charles Hopkins, a friend and perhaps a protégé of Dryden. In a letter to Mrs. Steward dated November 7, [1699.] Dryden wrote :

There is this day to be acted a new tragedy, made by Mr. Hopkins, and, as I believe, in rhyme. He has formerly written a play in verse, call'd "*Boadicea*," which you fair ladyes lik'd ; and is a poet who writes good verses without knowing how or why ; I mean, he writes naturally well, without art, or learning, or good sence.‡

Boadicea, Queen of Britain was printed in the same year in which it was performed, 1697. An examination of this tragedy reveals, I think, one reason for Hopkins' "good verses," and makes one a little sceptical of Dryden's statement that Hopkins wrote "good verses without knowing how or why." The play contains a number of allusions to Shakespeare not found in the collections of allusions

* "Shakespeare from a New Angle," in *Studies* (Dublin), viii. 1919, p. 452.

† For further details, see Chambers, *The Elizabethan Stage*, iv. pp. 17-19.

‡ Scott-Saintsbury, *Works of John Dryden*, xviii. 161-162.

prior to 1700; it is obviously indebted to Fletcher's *Boaduca* (possibly only through Powell's alteration), although historians of the drama have failed to note the indebtedness; and it perhaps even borrows from a poem by Dryden just completed.

I

What I consider allusions to Shakespeare, though they show no striking parallels, are of sufficient similarity, I think, to indicate that Hopkins had carefully studied certain of Shakespeare's tragedies and that he at times recalled when writing *Boadicea* striking bits of Shakespeare's phraseology. The four quotations which follow sound like echoes of *Hamlet*.

Start Eye-Balls from your spheres

Make thy two eyes, like stars, start from their spheres
(*Boadicea*, iv. i. [p. 39])
(*Hamlet*, i. v. 17)

Oh my prophetick Soul!

What have you done, my Love?
(*Boadicea*, v. i. [p. 53])
O my prophetic soul! My uncle
(*Hamlet*, i. v. 40)

Oh! Extasie of Love

(*Boadicea*, v. i. [p. 38])
This is the very ecstasy of love
(*Hamlet*, ii. i. 102)

Oh! my sick Soul!

(*Boadicea*, ii. i. [p. 16])
To my sick soul, as sin's true nature is
(*Hamlet*, iv. v. 17)

In *Boadicea* Decius, after raping Claudia, meets in battle her affianced husband, Cassibellan, who has been searching for him that he may avenge the wrong. Decius, when he comes upon Cassibellan, exclaims:

Of all Mankind I thought
To shun thee (V. i.),

and goes on to say that he has already done Cassibellan sufficient wrong. One writing such a scene could hardly fail to recall Macbeth's exclamation to Macduff:

Of all men else I have avoided thee.
But get thee back; my soul is too much charg'd
With blood of thine already.

II

Hopkins' debt to Fletcher seems to have passed unrecorded. Genest* merely states that the plot is based on history, and he is apparently followed by Ward, who distinguishes between Hopkins' play and the several alterations of *Bonduca*.† Much less true to history than Fletcher's play, *Boadicea* owes nothing (except names) to history which could not have been gleaned from *Bonduca*. *Boadicea* is indeed a true descendant of Fletcher's *Bonduca*, though two steps removed, as it is probably much more indebted to the Powell alteration of 1696 than to the original play. Certain situations mentioned but not presented by Fletcher have been elaborated, and a second love plot has been added to that recounted in the alteration. The process of change and elimination begun in the Powell version has been carried much farther. Hopkins omits not only Penius, but also Nennius, Petillius, Junius, Macer, and the hungry Roman stragglers. Even Caratach has disappeared, though his prowess remains with Cassibellan, who is substituted for Powell's Venutius as the lover of the elder daughter. But in spite of all these and many other changes, it is clear that Hopkins is indebted to the alteration of Fletcher and perhaps to Fletcher himself. In the epilogue there is perhaps a reference to the original *Bonduca* :

You Sparks, who knew the Story of this Play,
Thought to have seen two Ravish'd Maids to day.
But by our Bashful Youth one half is stiff'd,
My Sister only (to my sorrow) rifl'd.

This could refer to the account given in history or in *Bonduca*; in the Powell alteration all allusions to the girls having been ravished are, as Mr. Sprague notes, carefully expunged. But the indebtedness of Hopkins to the Powell version is shown in other respects. The name of the younger daughter Hopkins changed from the Bonvica of Fletcher and Powell to Venutia, a name clearly derived from that of the hero of Powell, Venutius, who has given way to Cassibellan. To Fletcher or to the Powell revision of Fletcher were probably due also the invocation by the Druids and the prayers of Boadicea and her daughters at the end of Act iv.; and only in one of these earlier dramas could Hopkins have found

* *Some Account of the English Stage*, ii. 118.

† ii. 697. Nicoll does not discuss the source of *Boadicea*, nor does Sprague in his recent volume, *Beaumont and Fletcher on the Restoration Stage*.

the material for his account of the death of Boadicea upon the city walls, her exhorting her daughters to a brave death, the elder daughter's readiness to follow her mother's example, and the younger daughter's anxious desire to live.

III

In September 1697, Dryden wrote his son: "In the meantime, I am writing a song for St. Cecilia's feast; who, you know, is the patroness of music."*

I have not been able to discover the date at which *Boadicea* was first performed, but there is no reason to believe that it was before the winter season. Hopkins' first play, *Pyrrhus, King of Epirus*, had been acted during the summer of 1695, but Congreve in the prologue offers the explanation:

Our Author's Fears must this false Step excuse;
'Tis the First Flight of a just-feather'd Muse;
Th' Occasion ta'en, when Criticks are away;
Half Wits and Beaux, those rav'nous Birds of Prey.

In all likelihood the publication of *Boadicea* followed close upon the initial performance, as did that of *Friendship Improv'd*, the first performance of which is dated by Dryden's letter to Mrs. Steward as November 7, while the dedication of the published play is dated November 1, 1699.

Dryden must, therefore, have been at work upon his ode at the time Hopkins was putting the finishing touches upon his tragedy. If there was borrowing of a conceit (as I think there was) it is difficult to say whether Dryden is paying Hopkins the compliment of borrowing from him or whether Hopkins took the conceit from Dryden. Naturally Dryden's use of the figure in the closing lines,

He raised a mortal to the skies,
She drew an angel down,

is much more effective than Cassibellan's exclamation occasioned by the sweet words of Claudia,

O Words, to charm an Angel from the sky.

As neither Dryden nor Hopkins seems to have hesitated to borrow striking phrases,† it is the more difficult to say which in this case

* Scott-Saintsbury, i. 341.

† For evidence of Dryden's borrowing of phrases, see the articles of G. Thorn Drury in *The Review of English Studies*, vol. i.

was the borrower. But it would, I think, be a strange coincidence indeed if, writing for occasions in the same month, the two friends should have independently used so striking a figure.

BALDWIN MAXWELL.

The University of Iowa.

CHAUCER'S PENSIONS IN APRIL, 1385

SKEAT, *Works of Geoffrey Chaucer* (Oxford, 1894), vol. i. p. xxxv, says :

On April 24 [1385], he received his own pensions as usual, in two sums of 6*l.* 13*s.* 4*d.* each ; and, on account of his wife's pension, 3*l.* 6*s.* 8*d.*

Pollard, *Chaucer Primer* (London, 1893), writes on p. 101 :

In 1385, April 20 fell on a Thursday, and we may expect that after a four days' ride the return journey would be delayed till the following Sunday or Monday. Another three or four days' ride would bring the poet back to London on Wednesday, 26th April, and by a curious coincidence, the very next day, 27th April 1385, we find him knocking at the door of the Exchequer to obtain his own and his wife's pensions, a day or two earlier than usual. Clearly his holiday had proved rather expensive.

Which is correct, April 24 or 27 ?

I had the curiosity—not altogether idle, as the quotation from Pollard will show—to examine the " Auditors Issue Roll," and found that Skeat is right : the date is April 24, 1385.

A. J. WYATT.

HAMLET, III. i. 148 f.

THERE seems to be no doubt that Shakespeare was a great reader, in whose memory sometimes passages left their traces which one would not have suspected to have come into " his ken " at all (*vide* Harsnett's " Declaration " and other cases). I hesitate to affirm that the following lines belong to this category. It is of course possible that the coincidence is quite incidental. The curious point, however, is the date 1601. Compare :

" What say you *then to painting of faces*, laying open of naked breasts, dying of haire, wearing of Periwigges and other haire ?

I have *heard of your paintings too*, well enough ; *God has given you one face*, and you *make yourselves another* ; you jig, you amble, and

"And what say you to our artificial women, *which will be better than God made them? They like not his handy-works; they will mend it*, and have other complexion, other faces, other haire, other bones, other breasts and other bellies *then God made them.*"

The Plaine Mans Pathway to Heaven by Arthur Dent, London, 1601.

The *Bestrafte Brudermord* (vide Furness' Variorum Edition) contains only the sentences: "Hearken, girl, you young women do nothing but lead young fellows astray. *Your beauty you buy of the apothecaries and peddlars.* Listen, I will tell you a story. . . ."

LEVIN L. SCHÜCKING.

Leipzig.

MUCH ADOE ABOUT NOTHING, IV. i. 145-160

THUS in the quarto (1600):

- Ben. Sir, sir, be patient, for my part I am so attired in wonder, I know not what to say.
 Beat. O on my soule my cosin is belied.
 Bene. Lady, were you her bedfellow last night?
 Beat. No truly, not although vntill last night,
 I haue this tweluemonth bin her bedfellow.
 Leon. Confirmd, confirmd, O that is stronger made,
 Which was before bard vp with ribs of yron,
 Would the two princes lie, and Claudio lie,
 Who loued her so, that speaking of her foulennesse,
 Washt it with teares! hence from her, let her die.
 Frier. Heare me a little, for I haue only bin silent so long, &
 giuen way vnto this course of fortune, by noting of the lady, I
 haue markt,

G.

A.

This is the bottom of the page; the rest of the Friar's speech from "A thousand blushing apparitions," is printed regularly as verse.

Benedick's first speech, and a part of the Friar's speech, it has often been noted, are printed as prose. Moreover, the page is unusually crowded, so that the last two words of the text are printed on a level with the signature and catchword. Some of the critics have come very near the explanation. Daniel was the first to point out that the latter part of the page was deliberately printed as prose to save space, and that "this same page of the Qto has received some

slight corrections in its passage through the press." He believed that this page was set by one compositor, and the next by another; an ingenious explanation which unfortunately diverted him from a better. Quiller Couch and Dover Wilson (1923), in a note on Benedick's disarranged speech, tell us that they "suspect abridgment of a longer verse-speech in the older version." They are so busy bolstering a theory that they do not consider the whole passage impartially, but evidently believe that the speech in its abridged form was meant for prose, and that editors are leading us astray when they "attempt to arrange it as verse." (To the ear of Sir Arthur surely the lines must appeal as verse pure and simple?) I forbear to comment on the note in which they discuss the lines "Hear me . . . fortune," for it is only remotely connected with my purpose, and Dr. Boas, whom they challenge, can easily refute it. Sampson (1923) comes nearest to the truth when he suggests that "perhaps an insertion in the text somewhere" afforded the reason why "space was found by printing Benedick's interposition and the beginning of the Friar's speech as *prose*." "Here again," he adds, "we probably have signs of revision."

The insertion in the text is the passage between the two speeches that were squeezed to make room for it. When Benedick says "I know not what to say," the Friar completes his verse and continues the conversation logically when he intervenes with "Hear *me* a little." It is very interesting to observe that Beatrice's impulsive outcry ("O on my soule my cosin is belied"), one of the finest dramatic points in the scene, was Shakespeare's afterthought.

There is still a problem. The ordinary number of lines on a page is 37, though some pages contain 38. The number of lines of type on the page under review is 39. If the disarranged passages were printed as verse, the full number of lines would be 41. But the interpolated passage comprises 9 lines; leave them out and restore the verse form, and 32 remain—an incredibly abbreviated page. Yet the pages before and after contain only 37 lines each, so that the 5 or 6 missing lines have not obviously been absorbed by local rearrangement of the type. Probably a short passage (5 or 6 verses) has been omitted on our special page or on one of those adjoining. It would be an inessential passage, and its absence would probably be discoverable only by some abruptness or lack of cohesion in thought, or some irregularity in the verse. I suggest, very diffidently, that it came at the end of the Friar's speech. As it

stands, that speech concludes with the words "Vnder some biting errorr," and Leonato takes up the verse with "Frier, it cannot be," and I can see no reason for the alexandrine.

J. LE GAY BRERETON.

A JOHN MARSTON LETTER

RECENTLY while going through a volume issued by the Historical Manuscripts Commission, namely, *Report on Manuscripts in Various Collections*, vol. vii, my attention was attracted to an interesting letter written by the dramatist and poet, John Marston, which seems, somehow, to have escaped the notice of his biographers. It is included among the *Additional Manuscripts of Sir Hervy Juckes Lloyd Bruce*, and is headed, "John Marston to Sir Gervase Clifton." No date is given for the letter, but the editor of the Report, Mr. F. L. Bickley, adds "[fl. 1600]"—while the letter itself is endorsed, "Poet Marston"—which is conclusive as to the identity of the writer. It is addressed to Sir Gervase Clifton, and may probably be dated as 1614 or 1615. Here is the text :

Lett me intreate you to addmitt my most inforced excuse for not yett sending the booke. First with my owne hand I wrott one coppye ; for all the rest which I hadd caused to be transcribed were given and stolne from me att my Lord Spencer's. Then with all suddeine care I gave my coppy unto a scrivener to write out, who is now oppon it and will instantly have ended it. You shall find it attend you att your returne from Sir John Harper's.

I hadd attended my Lady Dorithy if I could possibly have provided your booke, which only busines kept me att home. And so, I beseech you, sir, as this is a most true, so lett it be a most sufficient satisfaction for detaining my promise.

As for your carefull tendering your worde, it approves you worthy your name and noble ancestors, whose virtues the rumor of this contry hath given me att full.

Be you ever the heire of their virtues, as of their possessions, and my unworthy spirit shall ever acknowledge due honor to such merritt. I have now but one request to you, which is, that our acquaintance may grow to the deere title of frendshipp, which respectes not outward fortune but inward desert, wherein I will ever be most industrious to equall you. And so desiering ever to live in your loving remembrance, I rest the harty lover of you and your virtue.

From internal evidence I think I am safe in dating this letter *circa* 1614 or 1615, a little before Marston was presented to the living of Christ Church, Hants. (1616). It cannot be as early as 1605, as Sir Gervase Clifton was at that date a student of Cambridge; and the allusion to Sir John Harper must have been after the year 1605 when Harper was knighted.

A letter from the Earl of Shrewsbury to Sir Robert Cecil dated August 1, 1602, affords evidence as to Clifton's entrance to Cambridge:

As to the heir of Sir Gervase Clyfton, of a rare and excellent wit, who had notably profited under his tutor Rawlynson, the heir's uncle, Mr. Harpur, one of the two to whom his education is committed, is loth he should part from Rawlynson; but the other of the two would have him placed in Trinity College, Cambridge. Rawlynson, by my means, is to have a Fellowship in St. John's. Harpur and I beg you to further our views by writing a letter according to the enclosed draft.

This draft, which will be found in the *Calendar of the Manuscripts of the Marquis of Salisbury*, vol. xii., p. 540, is as follows, and is addressed to "Mr. Philip Tyrwhytt and Mr. John Harper, Esquires" by Cecil:

I understand that the education of young Mr. Clyfton, her Majesty's ward, and his allowance for his maintenance, hath been by his friends appointed unto you two, and, forasmuch as he is now by divers of his friends thought fit for the University, I have thought good out of the care that appertaineth to my place over all her Majesty's wards, to advise you to take such order for his present maintenance above her Majesty's allowance as shall be necessary, and that he may be sent to the University of Cambridge so soon as convenient, where I could also wish he were placed in St. John's College, because I am particularly acquainted that there is not any place in the University where there is a more careful master nor better government.

Clifton was soon after (January 1603) sent to St. John's College, Cambridge, and, as appears from Venn's *Alumni Cantabrigienses*, figures in its annals, being subsequently created a baronet, achieving the distinction of having married seven wives.

W. H. GRATTAN FLOOD.

AN ADAPTATION OF ONE OF DRYDEN'S PLAYS

WHAT appears to be a curious adaptation of one of Dryden's plays and its only appearance on the stage is announced in the following advertisement in the *Spectator* for February 15, 1712 :

At Punch's Theatre, in the Little Piazza, Covent-Garden, to Day and to Morrow, the 15th and 16th of this instant February, will be presented an Opera call'd, The State of Innocence, or the Fall of Man. With Variety of surprizing Scenes and Machines, particularly the Scene of Paradise in its primitive Station, with Birds, Beasts, and all its ancient Inhabitants : The Subtilty of the Serpent in betraying Adam and Eve ; a diverting Dialogue between Signior Punchanella and Mademoiselle Sousabella Pignatella, and other Diversions too long to insert here.*

"Punch's Theatre" was the scene of Martin Powell's famous puppet-shows, which were frequently advertised in the *Spectator* and which were noticed in the 14th, 277th, and 372nd numbers of that periodical and in the 44th, 50th, 77th, and 115th numbers of the *Tatler*. Presumably this particular "opera," which may have been suggested by the *Spectator* papers on *Paradise Lost* that had been running a little over a month, owed a good deal to its name-sake, since Dryden's *State of Innocence and Fall of Man, an Opera*, was intended to be an elaborate musical spectacle with "machines" and dances.† As Powell found no difficulty in bringing Adam and Eve on the puppet stage, we may dismiss Sir Walter Scott's suggestion that "The costume of our first parents, had there been no other objection, must have excluded the *State of Innocence* from the stage, and accordingly it was certainly never intended for representation."‡

RAYMOND D. HAVENS.

ON THE DEATH OF DR. ROBERT LEVET

IN the Note on the above by Mr. S. C. Roberts, reference is made to the text as appearing in the *Gentleman's Magazine* for August 1783, in the collected edition of Johnson's *Works* in 1785, 1787 and 1789,

* No. 302. The advertisement is quoted in Lawrence Lewis's admirable *Advertisements of the Spectator*, 1909, p. 255, where I first saw it.

† See R. D. Havens, *The Influence of Milton*, 1922, pp. 120-121 and n.

‡ Scott-Saintsbury edition of Dryden, v. 95.

as also in Boswell's *Life*, and in an edition of 1825. May I, however, call attention to the somewhat rare edition of 1805 by Thomas Park, published by Charles Whittingham for John Shape? In this edition (*penes me*) of the *Poetical Works of Samuel Johnson*, the tribute appears on pp. 85 and 86. It is the same as that given in the *Gentleman's Magazine*, with the following trifling changes:

- l. 1 *Hope's* for *hopes*.
- l. 8 *every* for *ev'ry*.
- l. 14 *hovering* for *hov'ring*.
- l. 15 *vigorous* for *vig'rous*.
- l. 17 *cavern* for *cavern's*.
- l. 24 *every* for *ev'ry*.
- l. 27 *the Eternal* for *th' Eternal*.
- l. 32 *Though* for *Tho'*.
- l. 33 *fiery, throbbing pain*, for *throbbing fiery pain*.

W. H. GRATTAN FLOOD.

CORRESPONDENCE

ST. ERKENWALD

DEAR SIR,

May I correct an error on the part of Miss Mabel Day who has reviewed my edition of *St. Erkenwald* in your October issue of this year? Miss Day's failure to notice, or to read through, my discussion of the Legend of Trajan (pp. xvi.-xviii.) has led her into a glaring misstatement, an unusual thing for so careful a student of alliterative poetry.

On p. 491 (*R.E.S.*, October 1927) she says :

But the *Chronica* gives no authority for the most striking element in our story, that of a pagan soul released from hell through baptism. Stories of souls being helped through purgatory by prayers and masses (a commonplace of Catholic belief) abounded everywhere.

Had she looked on p. xviii. of my edition she would have seen that the *Chronica Majora* of Matthew Paris *does* contain a version of the Legend of Trajan, the one great story in the Middle Ages which dealt with the possibility of a pagan soul escaping from *hell*.

Very truly yours,

HENRY L. SAVAGE.

The Editor,
Review of English Studies.

[The foregoing letter has been shown in proof to Dr. Mabel Day, who writes as follows :]

DEAR SIR,

May I assure Dr. Savage that I did read p. xviii, and that I still hold to my statement? Though the *Chronica* contains the legend of Trajan, it says nothing of his being baptised (and for this purpose brought back to life), which in *St. Erkenwald* is an essential condition of his release. For a precedent for this new and important element in the Trajan story we must still look to other sources.

Very truly yours,

MABEL DAY.

REVIEWS

Dramatic Publication in England, 1580-1640. A Study of Conditions affecting Content and Form of Drama. By EVELYN MAY ALBRIGHT. New York: Heath & Co.; London: Oxford University Press. 1927. 8vo, 442 pp. Price \$4.50.

A VOLUME such as the present may fairly be made the subject of some extended criticism, and such treatment is no more than what is due to the author's diligence in the collection of material.

Miss Albright has had very bad luck. Her work, begun in 1909, was compiled in outline by 1913 and completed in January 1923; the preface is dated January 1, 1926, and it appeared in 1927. Many things have happened in the last fifteen years, the most relative to Miss Albright's purpose being the publication of *The Elizabethan Stage*. Sir Edmund Chambers's four closely packed volumes appeared nearly a year after she had completed her essay, but more than three years before it was published. They cover a large part of her field with a grasp and assurance never before approached. What was Miss Albright to do? To take full account of them would have meant scrapping much of her work and recasting the remainder, and if she shrank from such heroic measures one cannot but sympathise. At the same time she does frequently allude to Sir Edmund's book, and if as a rule she failed to revise her argument and still more to check her facts by reference to it, one can only as a critic censure the omission, however as a human being one may secretly condone it.

But it is not only the accident of delayed publication that makes this book disappointing. In a sense it was out of date before it was written, for the main positions it attacks formed the orthodoxy of a generation ago rather than that of to-day. Miss Albright will reply that old beliefs and half-discredited assumptions still colour the minds and methods of scholars almost unconsciously, and that

it was necessary to drag them into the light and effect a thorough purge. There is no doubt some truth in this argument: perhaps more than one may be inclined to allow when the cathartic is offered to his own lips. Still, I cannot think that Miss Albright's methods of exorcising critical revenants are altogether effective. For one thing, scepticism and credulity are in her curiously blended. Scornful of those who believe the companies to have shown what she quaintly calls "an inalienable opposition" to the publication of their plays (p. 264), she assumes without discussion an almost universal practice of alteration and revision as a main prop of her critical position. While this will of course recommend itself to one school of critics to-day, it will meet with a chilly reception from another. And throughout her argument I at least get the impression that instead of the conclusions following from an impartial consideration of the evidence, the evidence is presented in the light of foregone conclusions. It may be a false impression, for there is a vagueness about Miss Albright's method of argument that often makes it difficult to know what exactly she thinks she can prove or is endeavouring to prove. The strength of her work lies in the range of her research, its weakness in the ordering of her material and the reasoning based thereon. She has read widely and with mind alert, but she has emptied her notebooks into her printed essay with a minimum of digestion, often without adequate reference, always—I am tempted to say—without verification or critical consideration. And the wideness of her reading is equalled by its naivety. Facts and quotations are taken at second or third hand without regard to authority or credibility. This may incidentally account for the state of some of the texts cited, such as the mangled passage respecting Greene on p. 223, but others must be due to her own carelessness. In quoting from the quarto *Merry Wives* on p. 305 she has run together two speeches which the original keeps perfectly distinct. Since her thesis is precisely the confusion of parts in the quarto this might easily be mistaken for deliberate falsification, were it not of a piece with the rest of her work. For she is pursued by a demon of inaccuracy in wait to pervert her every statement. Some instances immediately relevant to her main argument I shall need to mention later, here I will but justify criticism by citing a few of his more irresponsible gambols.

I think his prize antic is the statement respecting the *Isle of Dogs* that "Henry Porter, an actor by profession, was regarded as guilty of

part-authorship, according to an entry . . . by Henslowe" (p. 182). Suffice it that Porter was not an actor, that the entry makes Nashe, not Porter, the culprit, and that the entry is a notorious forgery. But less extravagantly his activity is evident on almost every page. Heywood, in a prologue printed in 1637, asserted that his "Play of Queene Elizabeth" had been piratically printed, and this is presumably *If you know not me*, 1605; but the demon insists on his slave writing that Heywood "complained in the 1605 version of *If you know not me* that it had been pirated" (p. 113). He is responsible for the absurdity that Ben Jonson "took communion at the table of [Lord] Salisbury" (p. 142), and that there were nine performances of *Friar Bacon* in five days (p. 278); also for crediting the Edinburgh *Arcadia* with a false imprint (p. 383). He has apparently deprived us of Miss Albright's discussion of type-setting as a home industry, to which there is an allusion on p. 343, but which I fail to find in the volume. A typical instance is the phrase (p. 280): "*The Taming of A Shrew* entered on the Registers as acted by Pembroke's on 2 May, 1594," which of course means "entered on the Registers on 2 May, 1594, as acted by Pembroke's"; but the entry does not mention the company. A Mr. Herpick is quoted as authority that the second Shakespeare folio had *two* titles set up for different publishers (p. 374), though Miss Albright is perfectly familiar with Mr. Pollard's work where the *five* variant imprints are duly recorded. Discussing wrong line-division in printed plays, she remarks that "the introduction of a new speaker seems to have tempted the Elizabethan compositor to assign to him a new line, even if the blank verse line were incomplete" (p. 341). Here it is difficult to know what Miss Albright has in mind, for what she describes is the normal practice. And when, amid such slipshod writing, she calls Middleton's *Game at Chess* a daring "cartoon" (p. 165), I am left wondering whether this queer expression is current American, or whether she merely means a "lampoon." Moreover, looseness of thought and expression sometimes leads to definite, however innocent, misrepresentation, as when she writes (p. 295): "Mr. Pollard then produces examples of 'sound errors' to show that the printer, Sims, probably dictated the text to a compositor (contrary to the usual custom of compositors)." What Mr. Pollard suggested was that certain errors were best explained by supposing that Sims occasionally helped his compositor in deciphering an obscure manuscript, and I think Miss Albright will find it difficult to show that

this was contrary to any known custom. After working with care through her pages one can only conclude that Miss Albright has not yet attained the accuracy of method and clearness of thought necessary to reach results of value in an admittedly difficult field of research.

Miss Albright's earlier chapters are concerned with the control and censorship of the stage. They contain much valuable material, but it is difficult to gather any clear ideas from such an undigested mass of facts, especially as they stand in need of much sifting. Miss Albright should have known that it was almost certainly the Lord Mayor and not the Lord Bishop of London who interfered with the representation of *Barnavelt* (p. 23). She thinks that the calling in of a book through the Stationers' Company was a "rather common method" (p. 88), but the only example she offers is the intrinsically absurd story of the suppression of Drayton's *Harmony of the Church*, which Dr. McKerrow disposed of in *The Library* as long ago as 1910. "Its author," she adds, "was obliged to apologize for his metrical version of the Psalms." Drayton's *Harmony* is not a version of the Psalms, and her only reference for the surprising statement is "Burn, *Court of High Commission* (1865), p. 37," an amateurish and largely second-hand compilation which I have searched in vain for any reference to Drayton.

How misleading vague inferences from undigested data may be is strikingly illustrated in a paragraph on p. 86.

Censors' objections which may have been based upon the proprieties served to keep out of English circulation for a time certain famous masterpieces, such as, for example, the "Decameron of Master John Boccace," which was at first licensed to William Jaggard by the secretary of the Bishop of London, but later had its licence revoked (March 22, 1620) [this was the date of entry, not of revocation] by the Archbishop of Canterbury. The same motive may have caused the cancellation (April 8, 1628) of an entry to Stansby of "A booke called Ovids Metamorphosis XV broken [*read bookes*] in English verse by George Sanders [*read Sandes*]" (originally entered May 7, 1626).

I do not pretend to explain the *Decameron* affair, which is one of those shady mysteries that cluster round William Jaggard and his son Isaac, but it is obviously misleading to quote the evidence of the Stationers' Register without adding that the book was duly published in 1620 and further editions issued in 1625 and 1634. The Archbishop's prohibition was absolutely ineffective. As regards Ovid,

it would indeed have been surprising had the authorities intervened to prohibit a book that every schoolboy read in class. The facts are that Sandys's *Metamorphoses* was originally entered to M. Lownes and W. Barrett, April 27, 1621, that Barrett's interest was transferred to J. Parker, April 3, 1626, and M. Lownes's to T. Lownes, April 10, 1627; that the copy was re-entered to W. Stansby, May 7, 1626, and that both entries (but not the transfers) were struck out "by order of a Court" on April 8, 1628, after the book had been regularly printed by Stansby in 1626, and perhaps even after the edition by R. Young in 1628. There were of course several reprints. These facts were all available to Miss Albright had she troubled to look for them, and they suggest, not suppression by the authorities, but some trouble over copyright. What Miss Albright could not know was the terms of the Order of Court, which ran:

This day Mr Sandes Patent for the sole printing of the 15. bookes of Ovides Metamorphosis by him translated into English verse, was openlye reade in the hall this quarter day: And it is ordered that th' entrance to Mr Barrett and Mr Lownes deceas'd of the first five bookes [the entry does not specify the number] and the assignment to Robert Younge [which seems to be a fiction, see Arber, iv. 180-1], And the Entrance of the whole 15. bookes to Mr Stansby shalbe all Crost out of the Register Booke of the Company, for that noe man shall laye anie claime to the printinge of the same or any parte thereof.

Thus authority intervened, not to forbid the circulation of a licentious work, but to confer on the writer as a special favour a monopoly in his own improprieties.

The Order supplies yet more evidence, were it needed, that at the time no one dreamed that an author enjoyed any copyright at common law. And this being the position with regard to copyright, I find it impossible to believe that the more difficult matter of stage-right was maintainable (or was recognised as maintainable) at common law. Yet this is the theory propounded by Miss Albright in her third chapter. I know of no definite evidence in its favour; it seems mainly dependent on the fact that infringements of stage rights in London were comparatively rare. But this is easily accounted for by a policy of live and let live. Each company had its own repertory, and to trespass on another's was to invite retaliation. The question has an immediate bearing on the alleged reluctance of the companies to allow the publication of their plays. This has unquestionably been overstated—even grossly overstated—in the past, and Miss

Albright's tables and arguments restrict it to very modest limits. No serious critic now thinks that the bulk of the Elizabethan printed drama was surreptitious or pirated; more and more we are coming to believe that most of it was set up from playhouse manuscripts honestly obtained. At the same time we must clearly distinguish between the conditions that obtained before and after 1600: the growing security of dramatic tenure, the growing seriousness with which dramatists regarded their works. I do not believe that the aversion with which in early days the companies regarded the printing-press is a mere myth, or that it was wholly groundless. The value of advertisement and the risk of staling (let alone stealing) might well be difficult to weigh, and there is one possible factor which has so far been left out of account. There is an *a priori* likelihood and at least some evidence (as yet unpublished) that provincial companies made up their repertories from printed sources.

As usual, the details of Miss Albright's argument are open to serious criticism. On p. 246 she suggests that old plays were often re-licensed to prevent acting rights being infringed on publication.

Thus, *The Renegado or The Gentleman of Venice*, licenced for the Cock-pit April 17, 1624, was printed 1630 as acted by the Queen's men. On October 30, 1639 it was re-licensed by Herbert under its subtitle . . . *A Winter's Tale* was re-licensed by Herbert on August 19, 1623, just about the time of the first appearance of the First Folio.

But the play licensed in 1624 was Massinger's, that licensed in 1639 Shirley's; they are distinct pieces. And we know from Herbert's own record that *The Winter's Tale* was relicensed, not for protection, but because the authorised copy had been lost.

That many dramatists published their own plays is true, but this is emphatically a seventeenth-century practice, which may be said to have been initiated by Jonson about 1600. We must be careful how we extend it to the previous decades or to all playwrights. Nor must we assume that consent to publication always meant overseeing of the press. In this Heywood stands for the older generation, Massinger and Shirley for the younger. Marston too, as Miss Albright truly says, "was not opposed, or even indifferent to having his works in print." But she is singularly unfortunate in adding (p. 213):

When W. Sheares, his bookseller, dedicated six of his plays in 1633 to Lady Falkland, he said, "Were it not that he is so far distant from this

place, he would have been more careful in revising the former impressions, and more circumspect about it than I can."

Sheares was altogether unauthorised in his impudent claim, and Marston, who had entered the Church many years before, was not so far distant but that he was able to insist on all trace of his authorship being removed from the peccant volume.

Chapter IV is mainly devoted to an attack on the belief that crises in the theatrical world, often the result of the plague, were in general responsible for the release of plays from the companies' stocks. Once again Miss Albright has no difficulty in showing that the theory, whether false or true, has been very loosely and uncritically applied. I am not sure how far it is valid for the seventeenth century, when the general position of the companies was becoming more assured and publication more a matter of course. But the plague of 1592-4 caught the companies at a critical moment and caused a dislocation in theatrical affairs unparalleled till the outbreak of the civil war half a century later. Indeed, in this instance, Miss Albright does not deny the "effect of the plague at least as an indirect cause" (p. 277). What she does is to whittle away the effect of her admission in particular instances. This leads her to plunge into the Serbonian bog of theatrical history. There may be students who are still unaware of the revolution wrought in the critical position by *The Elizabethan Stage*. Less than five years ago we were still most of us wandering in a jungle thick with a rank growth of deliberate or slovenly falsification and overgrown with an inviting but poisonous crop of flowers of fancy. We groped our way with infinite caution, though seldom with caution enough. It is not surprising that Miss Albright has altogether bemused herself in this "misty dim region of Weir." To follow in detail her strange imaginings would be futile and unkind. It would be hard to devise a more misleading mixture of fact and falsehood than this (p. 279): "The Admiral's and Chamberlain's men acted at Court together in 1586. Again in 1589 and from 1592 to 1598 they continued their co-operation, playing together at Newington Butts in June, 1594." Elsewhere she extends this alleged association to 1600 (pp. 267-8). Again, there is no meaning in the statement that "in 1593 the list of characters in the *True Tragedy of Richard Duke of York* showed two of Pembroke's men to be acting with the Strange-Chamberlain company" (p. 280). Of course, it is obvious what Miss Albright has in mind, but it is difficult to believe that she has even attempted

to understand the rather complicated evidence. Fantastic too is her apparent suggestion (pp. 281-2) that in 1597 the Admiral's men acquired a number of plays from Pembroke's because they were losing control of others belonging to Alleyn and Slaughter. They acquired the Pembroke plays because they amalgamated with the remnant of that company, and they amalgamated because Pembroke's had been broken over *The Isle of Dogs*.

In Chapter V Miss Albright considers the sources of printed texts. She very properly endeavours to restrict the hypothesis of piracy within narrow limits. But I wish she had made these limits clearer. One never knows whether what she is combating is the view that most plays were surreptitiously printed, or (without actually saying it) that any plays were. For example, I do not know whether to take seriously an apparently serious reference to the theory of Mr. F. G. Hubbard (p. 288). The view that the 1603 *Hamlet* is an authoritative text is as fantastic as that which would make the 1604 *Hamlet* stolen and surreptitious. If there can be reasonable doubt on this point the sooner textual criticism shuts up shop the better. It is some such downright statement as this that is lacking to give meaning to Miss Albright's position.

With regard to the analysis of sources we are as yet only at the beginning of our investigations, and a fascinating field lies open to the student. But Miss Albright has missed her opportunity, and her insight seems unreliable. The stage-directions which she quotes from Yarrington's *Two Lamentable Tragedies* (which she calls *Two Plays in One*) as originating in the playhouse, seem to be quite obviously due to the author: e.g. "Then Merry must passe to Beeches shoppe, who must sit in his shop, and Winchester his boy stand by" (p. 297). She is here as wide of the mark as when she finds in Hawkins's preface to the third edition of *Philaster* an expectation "that the text will be progressively purified in succeeding editions" (pp. 362-3). Among possible piratical sources she devotes most attention to the "Traitor Actor" theory, which seems to be her *bête noire*, and for which she apparently holds me mainly responsible. I will therefore refrain from criticism that might strike a too personal note, and hasten on to observe that touching memorial reporting Miss Albright has some extracts from and concerning Lope de Vega which are as new to me as they are interesting. I agree generally with her conclusion respecting shorthand, that "in view of the fact that no one has yet succeeded in making out a sure

case for the actual piracy of any particular play by stenography, the confident assertions by many of our best editors of Shakespeare's plays that such and such a play was put into print from stenographic notes are open to challenge " (p. 316). Miss Albright promises to pursue this subject further, and I shall look with interest for the results ; but I doubt whether she will find it as easy as she thinks to show " that stenography was taught in the public schools of England, [and] in the universities," say at the beginning of the seventeenth century, and I would suggest the expediency of carefully revising her dates, for those here given for Peter Bales's *Brachygraphy* belong to his earlier work *The Writing Schoolmaster*.

In her last chapter, on " Printing and Publishing Conditions Affecting the State of the Text," Miss Albright has collected a quantity of interesting material some of which may be new even to the expert. Her treatment of it varies. She is right in resisting the idea that dictation was ever more than an occasional expedient, at any rate in English printing houses. On the other hand, she is not very clear in her account of what she calls " privileged works," and there seems some confusion between " journeymen " and merely unprivileged printers. The question of the stock of type should have been discussed in connexion with the practice of submitting proofs. That authors often corrected proofs is not disputed, but in the cases of Palsgrave and Turner, cited on p. 351, it is evidently the preparation of correct copy, not the revision of proofs, that is in question.

Here even more than elsewhere it is difficult to follow the drift of Miss Albright's argument, but from various hints throughout the book (*e.g.* pp. 1 and 249) it is clear that her object is to show that piracy must not be inferred from corruption of text. Of course much depends upon what is meant by corruption. The most definite statement I have been able to find is the following (p. 366) :

In some cases the faulty state of the text is, of course, to be attributed to the irregular methods of acquiring manuscripts, resulting in the use of a poor version. But on the other hand, there are texts almost equally bad which were overseen by the authors and contain dedications and addresses by them.

Observe that she speaks of cases, not classes, and asserts that the corruption found in actually pirated texts can be paralleled in others issued with authority. This astounding proposition she makes no attempt to prove, and I do not believe it can be proved. Of course now and again a pirate may have been able to steal a good text.

But where are there known authorised texts comparable with *Orlando* or *The Merry Wives*? Until they are produced the sceptical conclusion is unwarranted.

And this, I think, is the most disquieting aspect of Miss Albright's book. Her lack of discrimination has led her, perhaps unconsciously, from an attack on this or that critical theory to an attack on the possibility of critical knowledge. "Now although this theory may be absolutely right," she remarks in one place (p. 296), "I would call attention to the necessity under which the modern editor labors of resorting to successive hypotheses in his effort to solve the puzzle as to the derivation of a text." What does she expect? Does she look for the certainty of deductive logic in the world of concrete fact? A theory is only an hypothesis in which we believe, and all history no less than all science is founded on such. The important question is what reason we have for believing it. Miss Albright's general conclusion, or rather perhaps the general impression left by her argument, is the sceptical one that the evidence we are able to observe seldom if ever justifies any definite conclusion. If evidence is observed with complete want of accuracy, and inferences drawn with utter laxness of method, the general conclusion is certainly unavoidable. But I do not see the necessity of either. Miss Albright's work will prove of considerable interest to future workers in the same field on account of the ample collection of materials it contains, but it would be a disastrous book to put into the hands of junior students.

W. W. GREG.

The Origin and Development of 1 Henry VI in Relation to Shakespeare, Marlowe, Peele and Greene. By ALLISON GAW, Ph.D. University of Southern California, Los Angeles. (University of Southern California Studies, First Series, No. 1.) 1926. Pp. 180. \$1.50.

OF this elaborate study of the First Part of *King Henry VI.*, by the Chairman of the Department of English in the University of Southern California, fifty pages are devoted to the determination of the date of the play, and the remaining hundred odd pages to the very difficult problem of its authorship.

The author tells us in his preface that, in view of the complexity of this problem and the importance of the play in connection with

the whole question of Shakespeare's early dramatic authorship, he has "resolutely resisted the temptation to abridge the material presented." It would have been well, I think, if he had been a trifle less resolute in this respect, if he had put his arguments more concisely and been less fearful of failure to take into consideration "all pertinent facts and materials." This applies especially to the discussion of the date of the play, which is very long and far from convincing. Briefly, Dr. Allison Gaw seeks to prove that the play cannot have been written before the beginning of 1592, and that it "received its first production on any stage" on Friday, March 3rd of that year, when 'Harey VI.' is first mentioned in Henslowe as having been performed at the Rose Theatre. Assuming the identity of 'Harey VI.' with 1 *Henry VI.*, this is, of course, quite possible, since it is the earliest reference to the play. But what evidence is there that it *cannot* have been performed before that date? It is to be found, says Dr. Gaw, in the allusions to the "turret" in the first and third acts.

In 1. iv. Lord Salisbury and Sir Thomas Gargrave enter "on the Turrets" with Lord Talbot and others, and are shot down by a "piece of ordnance" aimed by the Master Gunner's boy, whose entry "on the walls" is announced at the beginning of the scene. This stage-direction "Enter on the Turrets" and the remark immediately afterwards addressed by Salisbury to Talbot: "Discourse, I prethee, on this Turret's top," clearly indicate, according to Dr. Gaw, that the *theatre turret* was used—the turret from which was hoisted the flag announcing that a play was about to be performed. Now, it is known that Henslowe made certain fairly extensive alterations to the Rose Theatre in January and February 1592. At any rate the roof was newly thatched, the tiring-house altered, and twelve shillings paid by Henslowe for "a maste," which is quite likely to have been the theatre flag-staff. Up to this point we are on firm ground; after this in the realms of fancy and conjecture. Dr. Gaw is convinced that the alterations and improvements must have included the erection of a turret and, at great length and after much discussion of the early maps and views of London, he leads up to his conclusion that "a number of considerations point to the likelihood that the first turret in an Elizabethan theatre was built in the Rose early in 1592 at the direct order of Strange's men under the leadership of Edward Alleyn," that 1 *Henry VI.* was "the first new play presented in the rebuilt house"

and that in I. iv. and III. ii. it "seems especially and uniquely to 'feature' the turret, as the New York Hippodrome might 'feature' a new artificial lake."

It is not upon maps and plans alone that the author relies for support of his view that the play was specially written for the reconstructed Rose Theatre. He has discovered a curious feature of the text of I. iv. of the play "suggestively corroborative" of his conclusion, and it is this: In I. iv. (the scene before Orleans) when Salisbury asks for Gargrave's and Glansdale's opinions as to "the best place to make our batt'ry next" Gargrave suggests "At the North Gate, for there stands Lords," and Glansdale "heere, at the bulwarke of the bridge." According to Dr. Allison Gaw, the word *Lords* is obviously to be taken as meaning *Lord's* (i.e. "the headquarters of the Lord General, the citadel"). And on this interpretation he finds a discrepancy between the play and Holinshed—who in his account of the siege speaks of the capture by the English of "the bulworke of the bridge with a great Tower standing at the end of the same"—as to the relative positions of the tower, the bridge, and the citadel. I now quote Dr. Gaw:

. . . It certainly seems too striking to be a mere coincidence that as the actors stood in the turret of the Rose theatre and looked out of the east window of the turret over the pit and over the theatre wall toward the eastern section of the city, the two most prominent structures before them were the Tower of London and London Bridge, the former, the citadel of London, *there* and the latter *here*, just as described in the scene. When we remember the instinctive bent of the Elizabethan theatre toward realism . . . it seems highly probable that on the mention of the citadel and the bridge, the actors in the turret pointed out over the theatre wall toward the Tower and the Bridge, while the audience, with the sudden thrill of pleasure that always comes in the theatre when more is meant than meets the ear, recognised that their own London was being made to serve as the imagined Orleans of the play.

Though this picture of the impersonators of stout Talbot and his friends staring with eagle eyes towards the "citadel of London" is no doubt attractive, it seems a purely imaginative picture, and—in spite of Dr. Gaw's assurance that "the Rose is the only theatre in London before 1599 that fits the indicated topography"—utterly destitute of value as corroborative evidence that the play was specially written with a view to its performance at that theatre in the early part of 1592.

There is a consensus of opinion that 1 *Henry VI.* is Shakespeare's

revision of a play by other authors, the authors usually named being Marlowe, Greene, and Peele, though there is no external evidence that they wrote in collaboration. Dr. Gaw attributes the original play to four authors—Marlowe, Peele, and two unidentified writers B (perhaps Greene) and C, dividing it between them as follows :

I. i. Marlowe, I. ii. B, I. iii. Marlowe and B, I. iv.-vi. and II. i.-iii. B, II. v. and III. i. Marlowe, III. ii.-iii. C, III. iv. and IV. i. B and Marlowe, IV. ii.-vii. Peele, V. i. Marlowe, V. ii.-iv. Peele. He finds that Shakespeare has slightly revised parts of I. ii. and III. i. and ii., that II. iv. (the Temple Garden scene) and all but the first forty-four lines of V. iii. are entirely his, and that he has largely re-written Act IV., excluding scenes v. and vi., which are wholly Peele's. The last scene, V. v., which links the play with 2 *Henry VI.*, has been added by another, unidentified, dramatist.

In asserting that "practically no one except Fleay has attempted to assign the various individual scenes to the original authors, Dr. Gaw ignores H. C. Hart, who, in his edition of the play in the "*Arden*" Shakespeare, *has* made this attempt, assigning the scenes thus :

I. i. Greene revised by Shakespeare, I. ii. Greene, Nashe, and Shakespeare, I. iii. Greene, I. iv. Shakespeare, I. v. Greene, I. vi. doubtful, II. i. Greene, II. ii.-iii. Greene, revised by Shakespeare, II. iv.-v. Shakespeare, III. i. Greene ?, III. ii. Shakespeare, III. iii., iv. Greene, IV. i.-v. Shakespeare, IV. vi., vii. Greene ? revised by Shakespeare, V. i. Greene ?, V. ii. doubtful, V. iii. Greene revised by Shakespeare, V. iv.-v. Shakespeare, with perhaps some traces of Peele.

A comparison of the results arrived at by the two critics is interesting, if only as showing the almost complete divergence between them ; they differ as to the authorship of every scene but II. iv., which both attribute to Shakespeare. Perhaps both are equally wide of the mark—it seems, indeed, unlikely that any student, however acute and however familiar with the work of Shakespeare and his earlier contemporaries, will succeed in solving so difficult a problem. But at least Hart's method of tackling the problem seems preferable to Dr. Gaw's. Dr. Gaw's division is based scarcely at all upon the style or vocabulary of the play, almost entirely upon structural considerations, metrical statistics, and the differences observable in the spelling of certain proper names. He largely follows Fleay, as indeed he frankly admits in his preface, and the

impression one gets from his book is that he began his dissection of 1 *Henry VI.* with a preconceived notion that Fleay's belief in the quadruple authorship of the original play was correct, and then set to work to find evidence to justify a division of the various scenes between the four authors according to their subject-matter. Hart's conclusion that Greene's was the predominant hand in the play was arrived at chiefly by a minute examination of its vocabulary and phraseology, or, as he himself expresses it, by "adjusting the parallels" between the authors likely to have been concerned. No doubt this use of "word-clues" to identify an author's work requires great caution, and Hart certainly seems to place too much reliance upon it. Dr. Gaw objects to the use of evidence of this kind altogether on the ground that it cannot properly be applied without "a minute classification and analysis of several hundred parallels from a number of other authors also, including Shakespeare, Marlowe, Greene, Peele, Nashe, Spenser, the chroniclers, etc.," that "a complete collection of parallels is impossible without the aid of several non-existent concordances," and so forth. But if the vocabulary and phrasing of a play are not to be adduced in evidence in an inquiry of this kind except under conditions so strict as to be practically impossible of fulfilment, what is to be said of Dr. Gaw's use of metrical tests, his percentages of "feminine endings," and of "pyrrhic fifth feet"? We have statistics of Marlowe's verse and of Shakespeare's in three of his early plays, and whenever the percentage of feminine endings is "within Marlowe's range" the scene is attributed to Marlowe. Some statistics are given for the verse of Greene and Peele, but none for Nashe, Lodge or Kyd, or the numerous anonymous plays of the early fifteen-nineties. And when it is added that *The Contention* and *True Tragedy of Richard Duke of York* are included among Marlowe's works, and that in reckoning his percentages Dr. Gaw compares entire plays by Shakespeare and Marlowe with verse passages in 1 *Henry VI.* less than a hundred lines (sometimes less than twenty lines) in length, it will be seen that his metrical evidence is by no means so impressive as it at first sight appears.

In support of his attribution of the opening scene to Marlowe, Dr. Gaw does cite parallels from Marlowe's acknowledged works, four rather striking parallels for which he is indebted to Professor Tucker Brooke's edition of the play in the Yale Shakespeare. The remaining eight Marlowe parallels collected by Professor Tucker

Brooke are from scenes which Dr. Gaw assigns to other dramatists, and consequently these are passed over in silence. Moreover, Professor Tucker Brooke cites the parallels not as evidence of Marlowe's authorship but as evidence of his influence on the writer, or one of the writers, of the play. My own study of the play strongly confirms Professor Tucker Brooke's (and Hart's) opinion that Marlowe's hand is nowhere present. Notwithstanding Dr. Allison Gaw's strictures on the use of "word-clues," there is, I think, one kind of vocabulary test to which his objections do not apply, a test which may profitably be used here. Although the presence of an author's favourite words may not be conclusive evidence that a work in which they occur is his, the *absence* of them may surely be taken as fairly conclusive evidence that it is not. Marlowe has a large number of highly characteristic words and phrases which he uses with great frequency. So far as I have observed, only two of these distinctively Marlovian words are to be found in this play, "hale" (=drag) and "reflex" (=shine), and it is surely significant that the passages in which they occur:

I'll hale the Dauphin headlong from his throne.
I. i. 149.

May never glorious sun reflex his beams
Upon the country where you make abode.
v. iv. 87-88.

echo lines in Marlowe's *Tamburlaine* (Pt. II., iv. iii. 42 and Pt. I., III. 1. 51-52). One may therefore well conclude that the author who uses them here is not Marlowe but a borrower from him.

So far as Greene is concerned, even Hart himself, after all the labour he spent on the *Henry VI.* trilogy, seems to have felt doubts about his attribution to him of the lion's share in Part I., for he remarks, as a "confusing result" of his prolonged examination of the text, that "although we find Greene's methods of expression in so many places, the general style is not that of Greene." On the whole there seems to me no solid ground for believing that either Greene or Marlowe had any hand in the composition of the play. But that Peele was concerned in it I feel no doubt whatever. His hand is distinctly traceable in some scenes, and particularly in II. ii., III. i., and the first and last scenes of the fifth act. If, however, there was a "basic" play Peele was certainly not the chief author of that play; it must have been written by him in association with some dramatist or dramatists other than Marlowe or Greene. The amount

of Shakespeare's work in the text that has come down to us has, I think, been much underestimated not only by Dr. Gaw but by the majority of the critics. Dr. Gaw considers that Shakespeare first revised the play in 1594, and again more thoroughly in 1599, after he had finished 1 and 2 *Henry IV.* and *Henry V.*

The book makes hard reading, partly no doubt owing to the nature of its subject, but partly also because the author's style is diffuse and the gift of lucid exposition has been denied him. He has clearly taken much pains over his investigation of the authorship of this play, and if his conclusions fail, as I think they will fail, to secure general approval, it will not be due to any lack of effort on his part, but to the exaggerated value he attaches to metrical tests and to the highly unsatisfactory manner in which he has here applied them.

H. DUGDALE SYKES.

Dialogus inter Militem et Clericum. Richard FitzRalph's Sermon: "Defensio Curatorum," and Methodius: "*þe Bygynnyng of þe World and þe End of Worldes.*" By JOHN TREVISA, Vicar of Berkeley. Ed. by AARON JENKINS PERRY, M.A., Assistant Professor of English, University of Manitoba. London: Published for the Early English Text Society by Humphrey Milford, Oxford University Press. 1925. Pp. clvi+116. 25s. net.

THREE texts of great interest are included in this volume, and are preceded by a bibliography and by a lengthy introduction on the texts, their MSS. and early printed editions, their language, and the life and literary work of Trevisa, probable translator of the first text, possible translator of the second, and once reputed translator of the third.

The Harleian MS. 1900 has been used throughout as the basis of the text, and has been carefully collated with the other English MSS., with the exception of the Burleigh House MS., to the unfortunate disappearance of which the editor calls attention in his introduction. The text of the early printed edition of Thos. Berthelet of the *Dialogus* (first printed in London in 1553) is also given in full, since, as the editor points out, it affords interesting points of comparison with the extant MSS., and may well be based on a MS. version which has not come down to us. The Northern version

of the Methodius tract, from British Museum MS. Add. 37049, is also included. The collation of the MSS. and editions seems to have been made with care and thoroughness. The complete absence of notes, however, and the very scanty nature of the glossary are defects.

The introduction, while containing much interesting material, is of very uneven merit. Much of the material seems hastily put together, and the conclusions reached do not always appear to be fully borne out by the evidence brought forward. The evidence, for instance, that Trevisa was the translator of FitzRalph's *Sermon* seems to me inconclusive. On a good many points Mr. Perry is averse to expressing any final opinion of his own; he contents himself with a *résumé* of earlier criticism without committing himself to any verdict. This is particularly the case in his discussion of the dates of the various MSS.; he makes no attempt to date the British Museum MS. of the Methodius tract, though this has an important bearing on the place of authorship of the translation, and he is vague on the dates of MSS. generally. He makes no attempt to identify the authors of the notes from the Harleian MS. quoted on p. xviii of his Introduction.

The most valuable section in the Introduction is that dealing with the life of Trevisa. Particularly important are the evidence as to the date of his death and the identification of the Westbury, of whose collegiate church he was a canon, with Westbury-on-Trym in Gloucestershire.

In the section on the language, Mr. Perry is much less successful. The distinction between Old English short vowels which remained short in Middle English and those which underwent lengthening before consonant groups is not made clear. Actual phonetic developments and variations which are purely orthographical are frequently confused. The development of Old English *y* in Southern Middle English is given as *u*, with no indication as to the sound-value; and the account of the development of Old English *æ* is both confused and misleading. The wording is at times careless, as in such phrases as "In Chaucer O.E. *u* appears as *som*, *sonne*, *tonne*. . . . In London documents it appears as *cup*, *full*. . . ."

The Bibliography is fully and carefully compiled. Mention might have been made in the first section of Cardinal Gasquet's *Eve of the Reformation*, which contains a valuable discussion of the *Dialogus inter Militem et Clericum* from the standpoint of a

Catholic historian, and in the second section of the *Old, Middle and New English Grammars* of Professor Joseph Wright. The editors of the *New English Dictionary* are given as Murray and Bradley only; the names of Craigie and Onions should be added. In the list of books in which extracts from Trevisa's works have been printed, mention should have been made of Mr. Sisam's *Fourteenth Century Verse and Prose*, which includes a long extract from the *Polychronicon*.

HELEN T. McM. BUCKHURST.

The Court of Sapience. Spät-mittelenglisches allegorisch-didaktisches Visionsgedicht. Kritische Textausgabe . . . Von Dr. R. SPINDLER. Leipzig: Tauchnitz. 1927. (Beiträge zur englischen Philologie, herausgegeben von Max Förster, Heft VI.) Pp. 268. M.10.

THE nature of this edition is partly revealed by the fact that the text of the *Court* occupies ninety-three pages, while the introductory matter takes one hundred and twenty-four. Dr. Spindler states that the chief aim of his work is to prove that this poem cannot have been written by Lydgate. His method is to examine the language and metre of the poem exhaustively, comparing them point by point with undoubtedly authentic works of Lydgate. He thus reaches the following conclusions:—Final *-e* is not treated in the *Court* as in Lydgate's work. The dialectal features point to an origin in the North-West Midlands, probably in the neighbourhood of Chester; there are no characteristically Suffolk features such as one would expect Lydgate's work to show. The language and some of the references in the poem lead to the belief that the *Court* was written twenty to thirty years after Lydgate's death. The rhymes, and verse technique generally, differ radically from Lydgate's.

Lydgate thus disposed of, the editor next considers the possibility that the author of the *Babes Book* wrote the *Court*, and he shows that the treatment of *-e* final is identical in the two works and that both the metrical characteristics and the dialect of the two are similar. There is therefore a strong case for the identity of their authors.

Dr. Spindler holds that the poem, which is not found in the two earliest manuscripts of the poem, is the work of the writer of the *Court*; it is necessary to the understanding of the poem and is inseparable from it. That it is not by Caxton, as some have thought

he attempts to prove by showing that certain words, rare or used in a rare sense, are found in the proem and the main body of the poem, but not in Caxton's writings.

All these linguistic and metrical features are noted with a thoroughness and care that leave the reader in a subdued and acquiescent frame of mind. It is difficult to think of anything of this nature with which Dr. Spindler has omitted to deal. He acknowledges at the outset his indebtedness to the notes of Joseph Jäger, who would have edited the *Court* for the E.E.T.S. if he had not been killed in 1914. But one must give Dr. Spindler the credit for the thoroughness with which the work has been done.

The text of the poem is treated with equal care. MS. Trinity Coll. Cambr, R.3.21 is used as the basis, and good reasons are given for its choice. All variant readings from other manuscripts or from the early editions are noted. Whenever forms from such sources are preferred to the Trinity MS. reading, they are printed in the main text of the poem with a small \times in front of them. This method is very clear and doubtless useful, but some will find it irritating to read a text sprinkled over with such symbols.

This small complaint suggests the only general one that can be made against the edition. It is almost barren of interest for the student of literature or of social history. The poem has been made the text of an excellent linguistic treatise, but other aspects of it have been neglected. In fairness to Dr. Spindler it should be said that he does not consider it a complete edition. He has in preparation a discussion of the sources of the poem which will be published as a separate work, and which one will be glad to see.

DOROTHY EVERETT.

The Plague in Shakespeare's London. By F. P. WILSON.
Oxford: at the Clarendon Press. 1927. Pp. xii.+228. Price 12s. 6d. net.

THE history of Elizabethan legislation is a very convincing lesson in the futility of making laws without at the same time making it more convenient for the general public to observe than to ignore them. Whether in the matter of the restraint of usury, the prevention of engrossing of goods or forestalling of markets, the control of printing, theatres or building, or of the limitation of infection from the plague, one finds legislation which seems in itself excellent for its purpose,

carefully thought out and inspired by the best of motives, but which nevertheless failed to be effective because it did not coincide with the immediate interests of those by whom it fell to be administered. Legislation by mere command might be well enough when those who disobeyed could without more ado be seized and summarily punished by the sovereign's officers, but the time for this was long past, and the Elizabethans had not discovered the advantages of heavy taxation of the subject in lieu of a demand for personal service, and the transference of the duties thus compounded to a large Civil Service dependent for their livelihood on carrying them out. The regulations for the public health in particular, whether in normal times or in these of a plague-visitation, were excellent and "up to date," but instead of the compulsory levy of a tax sufficient to pay suitable persons to see to their execution, the duties were imposed on the public themselves, who were expected voluntarily to see that they were carried out with the aid of a few badly paid officials of the lowest type. The natural result was failure.

Mr. Wilson's book gives us an interesting if somewhat gruesome account of the methods employed in combating the plague from the mid-sixteenth century down to the severe plague of 1625. Two things in particular seem to be deducible from the details given of the measures and of how they worked. One is that the precautions taken or ordered to be taken remained very much the same during the period, only becoming slightly more elaborate with each visitation, and that *mutatis mutandis* they were very much the same as would be prescribed in a similar visitation to-day; and the other that the average Londoner of the Elizabethan period faced the danger with very much the same stolidity and refusal to panic as was shown by the Londoner of 1914-18 in face of the menace from the air. There seems to be remarkably little evidence that any considerable number of those persons whose duty it was to remain at their posts quitted them. The isolated complaints that we find of the cowardly flight of particular persons are in themselves sufficient evidence that such conduct was exceptional, while the regular and methodical drawing up of the plague-bills shows that the temporal government was in full activity. No doubt a number of the ordinary merchants and their families left London for more healthy districts, but it is difficult to see why they should not have done so. The town was notoriously overcrowded, there was serious difficulty in obtaining food, and from every point of view a temporary reduction

in the population must have been advantageous. There was surely no virtue in a pretence of "business as usual" at such a time as this. On the other hand, the great majority of the civic officials, clergy and physicians seem to have remained and carried out their appointed tasks.

The large amount of material which Mr. Wilson has collected in a serviceable form gives us, I suppose, as much information as we are ever likely to get as to what really happened during a visitation of plague. Unfortunately, however, official statistics seldom or never afford a satisfactory basis for the understanding of the facts to which they refer, and this is perhaps especially the case in such a matter as statistics of mortality. Even if we could trust in their absolute accuracy, the figures are only of those who died; nothing is said of those who took the plague but recovered, and there seems to be singularly little means of estimating the number of these. But the true picture presented by an epidemic will surely depend less on the percentage of those who succumb during its course than on the percentage which those who at any particular time are suffering from the disease bear to the population as a whole. Mr. Wilson's calculation that during the twelve-month's plague of 1625, one-sixth of the population of London perished, gives us an average death-rate of only 3·2 persons per 1,000 per week, or one in 300, and this, though heavy enough in all conscience, is far from suggesting the horror of the visitation at its worst. To realise this we must still have recourse to the plague tracts and above all to Defoe's terrible *Journal* of the plague of 1665, which though of course a fiction, was doubtless based on the memories of those who had experienced it. Much of the *Journal* must have applied almost as well to the earlier plague visitation as to that which it purports to describe, and Mr. Wilson's careful investigations, valuable as they are, can, I think, add little more to Defoe's narrative than a conviction of its essential truth.

R. B. McK.

Oliver Goldsmith's The Citizen of the World. A Study by
HAMILTON JEWETT SMITH. *Yale Studies in English* LXXI.
New Haven: Yale University Press; London: Oxford
University Press. 1926. Pp. xii+170. 8s. 6d. net.

THE author of this doctoral dissertation is well grounded in his main subject, the oriental influences and background of Goldsmith's first

successful work. It has been known for a long time that Goldsmith took as his model for *The Chinese Letters* similar collections of pseudo-letters, such as Montesquieu's *Lettres persanes*, Lord Lyttelton's imitation, and Boyer d'Argens's *Lettres chinoises*; that he used as books of reference the histories of Le Comte and Du Halde; and that he copied freely from all these works and others of a like nature. Mr. Jewett Smith, however, has submitted these sources to a fresh examination, and extracted from them those passages or details which Goldsmith obviously copied. He has also given us: (1) a list of works containing the "foreign-observer device" and (2) a table showing the dates of the essays, with their numbers in *The Public Ledger* and in the first collected edition of 1762.

Mr. Smith's book would have benefited considerably if he had consulted the annotated French translation of selections from *The Citizen of the World* made by M. D'Alviny in 1891 and the excellent work by Mr. A. L. Sells, *Les Sources françaises de Goldsmith*, published in 1924. Both these writers show that Goldsmith borrowed from works not known at all, or known imperfectly, by Mr. Smith—I mean Boyer d'Argens's *Lettres juives* and Marivaux's *Spectateur français*. Mr. Sells's work in especial would have saved him from other errors. As it is his book must be drastically revised before it can be placed in the hands of students. I have noted the following errors, some of which are not venial: Page 1, For "1860" read "1760". Page 2, It is an exaggeration to describe Johnson's nine exotic essays in *The Rambler* and *The Idler* as "numerous"; they form but three per cent. of the whole number. Page 3, Walpole's *Letter from Xo-Ho* is not a "poetical tract." (I sometimes wonder if any of the writers who glibly state, as Mr. Smith does, that this skit "ran through five editions in a fortnight" have seen them all.) The account of the Chinese craze in England is confused and imperfect; no one, for instance, would gather from it that the public owed *Hau Kiou Chooan* and *Miscellaneous Pieces relating to the Chinese* to the same hand, or that Arthur Murphy's *Orphan of China* is derived from Voltaire and Du Halde. Page 5, The statement that "the pseudo-letter . . ., save in fiction and in the work of George Lyttelton, was not widely known in England" before 1760, is not true, as Mr. Smith himself shows on pp. 34 and 114. Page 12, note, "The editors Kahl" is a slip which cannot be placed on the broad back of the printer. Page 34, Marana's *L'Espion du Grand Seigneur* was first published in 1684 (*teste* the

British Museum Catalogue). Page 36, The correct title of *L'Espion à Frankfort* is *L'Espion turc à Francfort*. Page 52, Lord Lyttelton died in 1773, not 1733. Page 92, Du Halde, who was born in 1674, could hardly have published his monumental *Description géographique . . . de l'empire de la Chine* in 1696. Mr. Smith is unfortunate in his dealings with Du Halde, "who," he says on p. 148, "passed thirty-two years of his life in the Orient." The source of this astonishing statement is, I conjecture, the Preface to the above-mentioned work, where we read (p. ix): "Ce Père . . . avoit demeuré trente-deux ans à la Chine." It is said by Du Halde of le père Cyr Contancin. So far as we know, Du Halde never travelled beyond the borders of France. Page 113, Mr. Gibbs noticed the resemblance between letter 38 of *The Citizen* and *Rasselas* long before Miss Conant. Page 148, There is no doubt whatever that the story of the much-wronged Dr. Cacafofo of letter 19 was taken from the first of Boyer d'Argens's *Lettres juives*. Mr. Sells tells us (p. 105) that this letter of *The Citizen* "est une mosaïque d'emprunts, dont deux aux *Lettres juives* et trois aux *Lettres chinoises*"; he adds, "un examen des *Lettres juives* révèle d'autres rapprochements encore."

At the end of the book there is a bibliography of editions used by the author. It contains the bare entry "Plutarch."

L. F. POWELL.

The Political Ideas of the English Romanticists. By CRANE BRINTON. London: Oxford University Press. 1926. Pp. 242. 15s. net.

MR. BRINTON has written a work which is interesting, stimulating and frequently irritating. That is to say he has written a good book. If it is objected that Mr. Brinton's opinions are here more conspicuous than the opinions of the Romantic Poets, he will no doubt reasonably reply that they ought to be. "Danger is the salt of thought, as of any other adventure; and history is an adventure in thought," he tells us at the outset, early displaying that aphoristic tendency which creates so many of the delights and dangers of his work. So this debonair knight of letters sets out to revisit deserted fields and fight over again "battles long ago."

Mr. Brinton makes occasional mistakes in syntax, but his style is readable and interesting. Thus we find: "Did the French

Revolution have a *different* meaning for him *than* for the Lake poets?" (p. 124). "To the *Morning Post* probably belongs the distinction of having published more good poetry than any (other) English newspaper" (p. 201). "Poor Thelwall, who travelled about the country lecturing on brotherly love and *the Revolution in nonconformist chapels*" (p. 44). A more important error than these, however, is the mistaken authorship attributed to the two quotations on pp. 16-17. These quotations are cited as the work of Edward Young, and are introduced to exemplify the curious similarity of opinion as to the province of the poet in politics, which Mr. Brinton believes he finds in the work of Shelley, and in "so colourless and moderate a man as Edward Young." But the quotations which Mr. Brinton adduces in proof of Young's ideas are not by Young. They are characteristic stanzas from the work of Akenside the republican poet, who, as Johnson described him, seems to have been a kind of Augustan Shelley. "A young man, warm with every notion that by nature or accident had been connected with the sound of liberty, and by an excentricity which such dispositions do not easily avoid, a lover of contradiction, and no friend to any thing established;" such is Johnson's description of Akenside; it might almost be Mr. Brinton's of Shelley. The resemblance between their verses is not therefore surprising. Nothing in the early eighteenth century, however, could be more remote from the lyric absurdities of Young than these stanzas from Akenside's Odes (Book I., odes 7 and 18) here attributed by Mr. Brinton to the author of the *Night Thoughts*.

It is not necessary to follow Mr. Brinton in detail from his first chapter in which he discusses the late eighteenth century, to the last "Conclusion in which nothing is concluded," as the wrapper significantly states. The author is able to see both sides in the discussions aroused by the political theories of the romantic writers, and at times shows a sympathetic understanding of their ideas and ideals. In general, however, he criticises their work from a standpoint remote from their own, and in consequence, their political outlook suffers distortion. Mr. Brinton approaches his subject as a modern "realist" ready to bring all things to the test of reason and experience. He is convinced at the outset, of the essential foolishness of the romantic temper. To him Wordsworth's "impulse from a vernal wood" is an "absurdity" and Coleridge is the only romantic who shows "a subtle, reasoning intellect."

This indicates a failure to appreciate certain elements in the romantic attitude, and to this are due the chief weaknesses in Mr. Brinton's book. He makes a largely unreal division between reason and romance; and placing himself in the camp of reason he sees his romantic characters only as an army of benevolent emotionalists, who, oblivious of reality and of the limitations of humanity, foolishly tilt at windmills in a vain attempt to establish impossible Utopias. This arrangement is itself unreal. The romantic writers, at least those who looked to the establishment of a new social order, had much greater subtlety of mind, a much keener perception of reality than Mr. Brinton suggests.

The fact is that the political views of the romantics cannot be adequately treated apart from the whole universe of the romantic faith. Any attempt to treat their political ideas alone presents them in a false perspective, in which they frequently appear merely ludicrous. The Romantic Revival in literature was due to the fact that a number of men were born at the time, endowed not only with extraordinary powers of artistic expression, but also with an extraordinary degree of imagination and sensibility, and consequently with that idealism, that love of perfection, which springs from these qualities. Thus romantic politics, like romantic literature, are dominated by this idealistic urge. The question then for the critic becomes, "How far were these ideals capable of realisation by humanity?" and the answer he gives will be determined by his attitude to the one undetermined factor in the problem, human nature itself.

Thus the struggle lies not between reason and emotion as Mr. Brinton seems to believe, but between optimism and pessimism, two attitudes whose basis is probably temperament rather than the wisdom of experience. "Belief," said Shelley in his *Necessity of Atheism*, "is a passion, the strength of which, like every other passion, is in precise proportion to the degrees of excitement." In that lay both the strength and the weakness of the romantic faith. For the classicists the golden age lay in a remote past; for the romantics it lay in a proximate future. So, inspired by the passion of this belief they led a crusade of optimism. For them, what was most real in human nature was its virtues; its faith and hope, its courage and unselfishness. These they easily fitted into their optimistic philosophy, and came to regard as the true nature of man. Whatever was unworthy was due to the institutions of society

controlled by those who were blind to this idealism. This also led them to an apparently excessive individualism, because the parties of the time had no such aims as theirs. As in the similar case of early Christianity in the Roman Empire, they did not oppose but welcomed solidarity of feeling of their own kind. They had ultimately, again like the early Christians, to make a compromise between their idealistic faith and the teaching of experience, and in that process many an apparent recantation was made. Nevertheless, even with Wordsworth, Southey and Coleridge, their basic idealism survived all the disappointments of experience.

Mr. Brinton makes too much of their somewhat facile acceptance in extreme youth of the doctrine of the perfectibility of man, and of their reluctant abandonment of it with the passage of the years. Despite their early generous enthusiasms for such Utopias as "Pantisocracy" was to create, they had a far greater element of the analytical reason of the eighteenth century than is usually recognised. They were not the credulous emotionalists that Mr. Brinton at times suggests. They had, too, a much more accurate perception of reality than his pages indicate. It was not that they were oblivious of difficulties and contradictions; it was rather that, as Shelley said, with them belief was a passion, with all that dynamic which passion gives, and which the analytical reason, as Blake saw, does not. The rational element in them led them to challenge the unproved but accepted beliefs of opponents who are frequently represented as rationalists battling with the irrational emotionalism of the romantics. So Shelley became the ally of so fundamentally different a character as Tom Paine, disputed on atheism, with more "reason" than his opponents, and attempted to convert the world to the practice of what he considered the basic principles of the teaching of Christ.

Mr. Brinton fails to realise how much the "sort of emotional revolutionary contagion" of which he speaks, was the result of the disintegration caused by the analytic reason of the eighteenth century, and how deeply that reason lay embedded in the minds of those idealists who, when the romantic era dawned, introduced into the mental and emotional unrest produced by reason, the dynamic of passion and the objective of an apparently impossible paradise. Eighteenth-century reason and romantic emotion were not, as is suggested, unrelated opposites or contradictories; they often worked together for a common end.

For these reasons Mr. Brinton's book, though interesting and in places unexpectedly free from prejudice, cannot be considered as a final discussion of the question. The romantics, despite all their mistakes and enthusiasms, were much greater realists than he believes, and had much more intelligence than he is inclined to allow them. Some perception of this fact seems to have come to him indeed before the close of his work, for the outlook in the final chapters is wider, the criticism fairer and truer, than in the earlier portion. It is significant of this, as well as of the power of an optimistic faith which ignores the doubtings of experience, that in the end, Shelley, the most ideal and impracticable of the romantics, stands as the one whose political ideals have the most influenced later politics and are the most vital to-day.

"Many of Shelley's most desired measures have been realised," says Mr. Brinton: "universal education, universal suffrage, complete religious toleration. He is to-day honoured as one of the founders of a great political movement. More than any of the other great romanticists, Shelley is now politically alive. . . . Shelley's thought is in itself a pure mysticism, a counsel of the impossible and a source of discontent and revolt. But intelligently handled by capable leaders it can be made a genuinely social belief." Mr. Brinton might have said more. He might have pointed out that to-day, our leading dramatist, a man in whom the critical, analytical reason is more developed than in any English dramatist preceding him, has been led to political ideals almost identical with Shelley's, and has expressed them in a different medium and form which attempt to convince the reasoning intellect as Shelley attempted to instil a mystical and emotional conviction.

The political idealism of the romantic poets then, was not ineffective, whatever apparent failure and recantation it involved. They were not politicians, they were artists, essentially creative, and much of the greatness of their literature is due to the fact that they meant to create not only a new literature, but a new world and a new humanity. It was not a modest aim, it challenged failure and almost inevitably provoked mistakes and absurdities. But at any rate it possessed vitality, and led to action such as the analytical reason alone failed to arouse. The politician had to feel its influence, to grapple with the problems it provoked, and to some extent to follow the idealistic path along which these poets were attempting to lead humanity. These were not insignificant achievements,

A more practical, reasonable faith might have achieved much less. "Many a man enters Jerusalem on an ass," says the proverb, and Shelley never hesitated to make himself an ass in his attempts to make Jerusalem more easily accessible. But to measure the political capacities of Shelley and his associates by such apparent absurdities is to be greatly misled. Anatole France was not lacking in that analytical reason which Mr. Brinton has adopted as his standard for the romantics, but Anatole France had also a much subtler understanding of the romantic temper, and it was that which led him to say in *L'Histoire Comique* :

Il y a au moins une chose certaine. C'est que la bêtise empêche souvent de faire des bêtises. Je l'ai remarqué bien des fois. Hommes ou femmes, ce ne sont pas les plus bêtes qui agissent le plus bêtement.

Despite all their mistakes and failures, the idealistic vision of the great romantics, their insistent longing for perfection, is still an inspiration to men, an influence which is becoming a part of and shaping reality, impossible as at one time their ideals might seem. At the lowest estimate, we may reasonably reply that the politics of these poets stand examination better than the poetry of the politicians ; at the highest, we may still hesitate before we erase the challenge of Shelley,

Poets are the unacknowledged legislators of the world.

OSWALD DOUGHTY.

The Place-Names of Bedfordshire and Huntingdonshire.

By A. MAWER and F. M. STENTON. English Place-Name Society. Vol. III. Cambridge University Press. 1926. Pp. xlii+316. 18s. net.

THE archæological evidence for the intermingling of Anglian and Saxon culture in these two counties, is supported by the researches here set forth. For Hunts., Messrs. Mawer and Stenton indicate a first settlement by the earliest Anglian invaders : for Beds., which contains little evidence of settlement before 571, they prefer to leave open the question of the priority of Angle or Saxon until further evidence of personal-names is available.

The Saxon element is itself a difficult problem. If the *Old English Chronicle* proves an advance from the West, the editors' notes on the dialect might imply that East Saxons also had a share in the settlement. One remarks that although Messrs. Mawer and

Stenton are able definitely to identify the four towns taken by Cuthwulf, they reject the usual view that the *Bedcanford* of the *O.E. Chronicle* is Bedford.

The two counties do not present many feudal names; and Scandinavian names also, especially in Beds., are few in number. For Hunts. proof is given of both Danish and Norwegian settlement.

Celtic elements have survived only in *Brickhill*, *Kempston*, and *Lattenbury*, and in a few river-names. To the latter I would add *Husborne* (and *Hurstbourne* in Hants.). Not only the prevalence of M.E. *u*-forms, but the O.E. forms with *ss*, make connexion with *hyse* unlikely. I suggest that *Hyssanburna* is a compound of the *Brickhill* type, disguising some form of the O. Welsh *uisc* (cf. Max Förster, *Ablaut in Flussnamen*).

One has been interested to note that some of the editors' conjectural O.E. personal-names might derive support from a closely cognate language. Thus their **Giella* still survives in West Friesland as *Ielle*; their **Poppa* as *Poppe* (with a variant *Pôpe*, which suggests an O.E. **Popa*); their **Hætta* as *Hatte* (cf. also the place-names *Hattem* and *Hatten*). Their **Teobba* is yet found in Groningen as *Tebba*. And obsolete Frisian names, such as *Folke*, *Hadde* (cf. also *Haddenhausen* in Westphalia), *Hutte*, *Polle*, *Reve*, *Seve*, *Wasse* (cf. also *Wassink* in Oldenburg), *Wera* and *Wara*, afford useful additional support of English etymologies.

I do not know whether the place-name element *-wyk*, commonly applied in Friesland to a channel cut in the peat-marsh, will throw any light on the meaning of *Great Whyte*.

The explanation of *Conger Hill* is not convincing. Does *Cungar* conceal some corrupted Danish form? The second syllable may well represent *garðr*: is the first element conceivably the same as that in *Conington*?

From the Addenda it would appear that Ritter's etymology of *Clapham* is right; and the interpretation will then be "homestead of the boulders."

To those acquainted with the previous work of the two learned authors of this book it would be superfluous to point out the care and scholarship evinced on every page. The volume is packed full of matter which should interest and entertain most readers of the *Review of English Studies*, and lead a good many of them, one hopes, to become members of the Place-Name Society.

J. H. G. GRATTAN.

Essays and Studies by Members of the English Association. Vol. XII. Collected by JOHN BUCHAN. Oxford: at the Clarendon Press. 1926. 8vo. Pp. 119. 7s. 6d.

THE current volume of *Essays and Studies* opens with an article by Professor Garrod upon Milton's lines on Shakespeare, a subject which leads to the discussion of textual problems and of Milton's attitude towards contemporary drama. Professor Garrod's plea for a critical edition of Milton's poems serves to connect his article with that of Mr. R. W. Chapman, whose "Proposals for a new edition of Johnson's Letters" are reprinted from a paper read to the Association in December 1925. Professor Herbert Wright contributes a study on "The Associations of T. L. Peacock with Wales"; in emphasising the strain of Celtic romanticism running through Peacock's work he speaks with the enthusiasm and authority of one who has himself traversed the ground and caught the glamour of local associations. Mr. H. Clement Notcutt, discussing "*The Faerie Queene* and its critics," defends Spenser against the charges of incoherence and carelessness in construction. He makes a fair case; but it is doubtful whether such special pleading, even if it convinces, is either valuable or necessary. Mr. Alexander Macmechan writes on "Canadian Literature: the Beginnings," describing the work of loyalist exiles from America after the Revolution and of the two pioneers in Nova Scotia, Joseph Howe and Thomas Chandler Halliburton. The volume concludes with a most welcome study upon the authorship and origin of Scottish ballads by Mr. Alexander Keith, whose evidence and sound reasoning should create a considerable flutter in "communistic" dovescotes.

BERNARD E. C. DAVIS.

New Methods for the Study of Literature. By EDITH RICKERT. (University of Chicago Press.) London: Cambridge University Press. 1927. Pp. xiii+275. 15s. net.

IN this book Professor Rickert explores some new and interesting ways of approaching literature. Starting from the theory that literature "is nothing more than certain arrangements of certain words," Professor Rickert considers that "if, as we read, we could 'pick up infallibly one by one all those minute signals by which a

phrase is made to hint, to turn, to live,' there would be no need to study literature at all. The mind of the reader would immediately absorb all that literature has to give, and there would be nothing more to do." Unfortunately, however, the quality of great literature "may be unapprehended because there is no community of experience between the writer and reader; or it may be unapprehended because the word patterns are so complex and so subtle that, except to an unusually complex and subtle mind, they do not at once yield their full content." Herein, according to Professor Rickert, lies the justification of scientific analysis in literature. Literature must be approached in a more careful and methodical way than the present "impressionistic, hit-or-miss" method. In order to do this, Professor Rickert separates style into Imagery, Words, Thought Patterns, Rhythm, Tone Patterns, and Visual Devices, and proceeds to give elaborate methods for analysing these features, and for tabulating and graphing the results obtained. Many of the methods are new, and all are very carefully worked out, even to the extent of describing a card index system for the classification of imagery.

However, the methods are so detailed that it would be almost impossible to analyse the whole of an author's work by their means. Professor Rickert usually suggests the analysis of extracts of varying lengths, but does not say how they are to be chosen. It seems evident that they should be characteristic of the author's work, or the analysis would be of little use. In choosing these passages we are still dependent on the old methods of criticism which, for this reason alone, will never be replaced by the new ones suggested here.

Professor Rickert says that her methods are important not so much for the body of facts which may be assembled by their means, but because a study of them will quicken perception of the devices of style. In this way they will be valuable adjuncts to the present system of criticism. They should also prove useful in deciding questions of authorship. The book should have further value in directing attention to the possibilities and limitations of systematic and methodical criticism, and if, as Professor Rickert hopes, it will be a means of aiding the teaching and study of literature, the work will not have been in vain.

N. R. TEMPEST.

SUMMARY OF PERIODICAL LITERATURE

BY H. WINIFRED HUSBANDS

- ANGLIA, Vol. LI. (Neue Folge XXXIX.), August 1927—
Unechte Ælfric-texte (Karl Jost), pp. 81-103.
Elizabethan Sea Drama and its Staging (Louis B. Wright), pp. 104-18.
Wie ein Volkslied wird (Kurt Nagel), pp. 119-20.
Sally in our Alley.
Zu den Waldere-Bruchstücken (Fr. Klæber), pp. 121-27.
Victor Langhans und die Unechtheit des F-Prologs in Chaucers
Legende von guten Frauen (Hugo Lange), pp. 128-35.
Der Lear-Vers oder der englische Doehmius (E. W. Scripture),
pp. 136-38.
Damn (P. Fijn van Draat), pp. 139-45.
Use as adjective and adverb.
Stark (P. Fijn van Draat), pp. 146-55.
Development of meanings.
Weitere Beiträge zur altenglischen Wortforschung (Otto B. Schlutter),
pp. 156-63.
mætoecht; cýngerunn; cernan; þwære.
Byrons Vorfahren und Kindheit (Hermann Conrad), pp. 164-73.
Scottish Adverbs (Elisabeth Westergaard), pp. 174-76.
- BULLETIN OF THE JOHN RYLANDS LIBRARY, Vol. 11, July 1927—
Art and Nature (B. S. Alexander), pp. 256-72.
Shakespeare and the Arts (C. H. Herford), pp. 273-85.
- CORNHILL MAGAZINE, August 1927—
Austin Dobson: Some Letters from His Friends (Alban Dobson),
pp. 129-46.
Continued, September, pp. 366-81.
- ENGLISCHE STUDIEN, Vol. 61, September 1927—
Leben und Lernen in England im 15. und 16. Jahrhundert (Margarete
Rösler), pp. 321-85.
A Special Dialectal Development of O.E. *ea* in Middle English
(Barbara A. Mackenzie), pp. 386-92.

SUMMARY OF PERIODICAL LITERATURE 123

Maurice Baring (Karl Arns), pp. 393-414.

Poetische Übereinstimmungen (Helene Richter), pp. 415-24.

HISTORY, Vol. XII., No. 47, October 1927—

History in Pantomime (A. H. Dodd), pp. 215-26.

Political and literary allusions in London Christmas pantomimes, 1831-79.

LIBRARY, Vol. VIII., September 1927—

Richard Tottell—his Life and Work (H. J. Byrom), pp. 199-232.

Keep the Widow Waking: A Lost Play by Dekker (concluded)
(Charles Sisson), pp. 233-59.

LONDON MERCURY, Vol. XVI., September 1927—

Bibliographies of Modern Authors (Gwendolen Murphy), pp. 525-30.

Edward Thomas (b) Prose; W. H. Davies.

Continued November, pp. 76-80.

—October—

Johnson's Books (S. C. Roberts), pp. 615-24.

MODERN LANGUAGE REVIEW, Vol. XXII., October 1927—

Chaucer and Lady Fortune (H. R. Patch), pp. 377-88.

A Cure for a Cuckold by Heywood, Rowley and Webster (H. D. Gray),
pp. 389-97.

The New Chaucer Items (Samuel Moore), pp. 435-38.

Text of Close Rolls of February 21, 1395; March 5, 1396; April 6, 1396.

Notes on *The Knightes Tale* (P. E. Dustoor), pp. 438-41.

On A 1612-14, 1882-84, 2153, 2179, 2450, 2623-5, 2815, 2892 ff.

A Hundreth Sundrie Flowres (W. W. Greg), pp. 441-42.

Bibliographical note.

Benedick's Love Symptoms: Cosmetics and Costume (M. Channing
Linthicum), pp. 442-44.

Lincoln v. Dymock and a Scurrilous Play, 1610 (Helen E. Sandison),
pp. 444-46.

MODERN PHILOLOGY, Vol. XXV., August 1927—

Classic Myths in English Verse (1557-89) (Douglas Bush), pp. 37-47.

Lydgate and Coluccio Salutati (Eleanor P. Hammond), pp. 49-57.

Chaucer's Pardoner of Rouncival (Samuel Moore), pp. 59-66.

Notes on the hospital of St. Mary of Rouncival.

The Indebtedness of Sir John Davies' *Nosce Teipsum* to Philip
Mornay's *Trunesse of the Christian Religion* (George T. Buckley),
pp. 67-78.

"Goode Lief, My Wyf" (Edith Rickert), pp. 79-82.

Note on *Canterbury Tales*, B. 3984.

The Upstart Crow (Helen P. South), pp. 83-86.

Antecedents of Greene's metaphor.

Malvolio's Cross-gartered Yellow Stockings (M. Channing Linthicum), pp. 87-93.

Milton and the *Aminta* (Allan H. Gilbert), pp. 95-99.

MONTHLY CRITERION, Vol. VI., August 1927—

Chaucer and the Great Italian Writers of the Trecento—II. (Mario Praz), pp. 131-57.

Bibliography, September, pp. 238-42.

NINETEENTH CENTURY AND AFTER, Vol. CII., September 1927—

Lockhart's Treatment of Scott's Letters (Davidson Cook), pp. 382-98.

—October—

The Position of the late Sir Walter Raleigh among Literary Critics (H. L. A. Hart), pp. 528-45.

NOTES AND QUERIES, Vol. 153, August 6, 1927—

Further Notes on *Two Lamentable Tragedies* (Robert A. Law), pp. 93, 94.

Further evidence of Yarrington's authorship.

Hamlet: an Amendment (F. H. Underwood), pp. 102-03.

The "dram of eale."

—August 20—

Some Unpublished Letters of George Canning (Fred R. Gale), pp. 129-33.

Concluded, August 27, pp. 147-50.

—August 27—

John Dunbar, Epigrammatist (G. C. Moore Smith), pp. 150-52.

Goldsmith's *Essays*: Dates of Original Publication (R. S. Crane), p. 153.

"Kettledrum": "Drummie" (A. Francis Steuart), p. 153.

Unrecorded meanings.

Graves's *Spiritual Quixote* (J. L.).

Originals of characters.

—September 3—

The Dialect of Nottingham and District (S. E. Mann), pp. 165-67.

—September 10—

Notes on the Text of *The Merry Devil of Edmonton* (H. Dugdale Sykes), p. 187.

On i. iii. 97 and v. ii. 3.

—October 22—

The Proving of Shakespeare's Will (S. O. Addy), pp. 291-92.

—October 29—

A Neglected Factor in Place-Names (Alfred Watkins), pp. 311-15.
Influence of trade-routes.

SUMMARY OF PERIODICAL LITERATURE 125

PHILOLOGICAL QUARTERLY, Vol. VI., July 1927—

- The Relation of the First Quarto Version to the First Folio Version of Shakespeare's *Henry V.* (Hardin Craig), pp. 225-34.
- Wordsworth and Hugh Blair (E. C. Knowlton), pp. 277-81.
- Milton's Puritanism ; or, the Issue Clouded (Elbert N. S. Thompson), pp. 291-94.
- Notes on Shakespeare's Classical Mythology (Douglas Bush), pp. 295-302.
- The Renewal of the Hundred Years' War in Shakespeare (A. R. Benham), pp. 303-06.
Possible debt to Aegidius Romanus.
- Unnoted Proverbs and Proverbial Allusions in *Twelfth Night* (M. P. Tilley), pp. 306-11.
- Thomas Kyd's Early Company Connections (T. W. Baldwin), pp. 311-13.
- Chauceriana (Edwin B. Place), pp. 313-14.
Unnoted parallels between Chaucer and Roman literature.
- Bede and Gregory of Tours (A. S. Cook), pp. 315-16.

PUBLICATIONS OF THE MODERN LANGUAGE ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA, Vol. XLII., September 1927—

- Tamburlaine and Marlowe (Leslie Spence), pp. 604-22.
Tamburlaine's character in history and in the tragedy.
- The Songs in Lyly's Plays (John R. Moore), pp. 623-40.
On question of authorship.
- New Facts about Henry Porter (Rosetta E. Shear), pp. 641-55.
- Animal Actors on the English Stage before 1642 (Louis B. Wright), pp. 656-69.
- Hermus vs Hormuz (F. P. Magoun, Jr.), pp. 670-72.
Note on *The Drinking Academy*, i. ii.
- Robert Armine, the Foole (Austin K. Gray), pp. 673-85.
- Shakespeare's *Richard II.* and the Essex Conspiracy (Evelyn M. Albright), pp. 686-720.
- Thomas Kyd and the First Quarto of *Hamlet* (Henry D. Gray), pp. 721-35.
- Shakspeare and the Unhappy Happy Ending (Alwin Thaler), pp. 736-61.
- Some Marginalia on Shakespeare by S. T. Coleridge (Thomas M. Raysor), pp. 762-65.
Notes omitted or altered by Hartley Coleridge.
- Thomas Middleton and the Fashion in Playmaking (Helene B. Bullock), pp. 766-76.
- Corrections to the Text of *Believe as You List* (Samuel A. Tannenbaum), pp. 777-81.
- Bolingbroke and Voltaire—a Fictitious Influence (Norman L. Torrey), pp. 788-97.

REVUE ANGLO-AMÉRICAIN, Vol. IV., August 1927—

L'Embonpoint d'Hamlet (J. Derocquigny), pp. 527-29.

La Condamnation de *Tom Jones* à Paris (A. Digeon), pp. 529-31.

Les Sources de la Roxana de Daniel de Foë (P. Dottin), pp. 531-34.

—Vol. V., October 1927—

Herman Melville et "Moby Dick" (R. Galland), pp. 1-9.

Mr. Galsworthy conteur (L. Wolff), pp. 10-28.

La question des origines anglo-saxonnes (P. Descamps), pp. 29-38.

Les deux Arcades de Sir Philip Sidney (F. C. Danchin), pp. 39-52.

STUDIES IN PHILOLOGY, Vol. XXIV., October 1927—

Certain Fallacies and Irrelevancies in the Literary Scholarship of the Day (Elmer E. Stoll), pp. 485-508.

Samuel Sheppard and his Praise of Poets (Hyder E. Rollins), pp. 509-555.

The Use of the Vulgate in *Piers Plowman* (M. Ray Adams), pp. 556-66.

The Source of Henry Vaughan's Ideas Concerning God in Nature (A. C. Judson), pp. 592-606.

TIMES LITERARY SUPPLEMENT, August 4, 1927—

A Keats Replica (G. D. Stout), p. 533.

Identity of edition found on body of Shelley.

—August 11—

Melodrama in Fiction (Michael Sadleir), p. 548.

Continuity from Eighteenth Century onwards.

Latimer's Seven Sermons, 1562 (William Talbot), p. 548.

Bibliographical. Further note by Henry R. Plomer, August 18, p. 561.

Chaucer at the Funeral of the Princess of Wales (Edith Rickert), p. 548.

Milton and a School Prayer (S. H. Steadman), p. 548.

Note on *Paradise Regained*, IV, 213-20.

—August 18—

The Facsimile Edition of the *Christian Year* (George C. Peachey), p. 561.

Blake, Shields and Rossetti (Percy Withers), p. 561.

—August 25—

Two Masters of Comedy, pp. 565-66.

Chaucer and Jane Austen.

Newton and Wordsworth (S. G. Dunn), p. 576.

Coleridge and the Watsons (Alice D. Snyder), p. 576.

Confusion of identity.

Cashel Books in Marsh's Library (Newport B. White), p. 576.

TIMES LITERARY SUPPLEMENT, September 1—

Shenstone and his Friends (Marjorie Williams), pp. 591-92.

Blake in the Abbey (W. R. Lethaby), p. 592.

Drawings of tombs for Basire.

The Text of Norton Nicholls's *Reminiscences of Gray* (Paget Toynbee), p. 592.

Macaulay's New Zealander (G. D. Stout), p. 592.

Further notes by Hibernicus, Harold Temperley and Robert Bracey, September 8, p. 608; by Hibernicus and George Sampson, September 15, p. 624.

Leigh Hunt and Shelley (Louis Landré), p. 592.

MS. note in Leigh Hunt's copy of Shakespeare.

September 8—

The *Deserted Village* in Prose (1762) (Ronald S. Crane), p. 607.

Essay in *Lloyd's Evening Post*.

Blake and London (E. Jeffries Davis), p. 608.

Site of "Jerusalem." Notes by Frank Penny, September 15, p. 624, and John Sampson, September 22, p. 647.

Spenser's *Mansilia* (Helen E. Sandison), p. 608.

September 15—

The Duration of Johnson's Residence at Oxford (Aleyn L. Reade), p. 624.

September 22—

A Shelley Poem? (Walter E. Peck), p. 647.

Authorship of *Vox et Praeterea Nihil*. Replies by R. W. King and W. H. Woollen, September 29, p. 667.

Othello, III. iii. 453-56 (Henry Cuninghame), p. 647.

Erasmus and Neurasthenia (R. G. Abercrombie), p. 647.

The Romance of Alexander (John M. Manly), p. 647.

Reference in Plea and Memoranda Rolls.

September 29—

Thomas Traherne (M. L. Dawson), p. 667.

Biographical details. Notes by Arthur W. Hopkinson, October 6, p. 694; Alfred Watkins, October 20, p. 743; C. Price, October 27, p. 767.

October 6—

Boswell's Executors (John N. Bryson), p. 694.

The Five Act Divisions in *Henry V.* (William Poel), p. 694.

Piggesanye (John M. Manly), p. 694.

Meaning of word.

A Lantor Manuscript (Stephen Wheeler), p. 694.

English original of Latin poem.

October 13—

The First Dublin Edition of *Robinson Crusoe* (1719) (E. R. McC. Dix), p. 715.

Further note, October 20, p. 742.

Etherege and Cowley (Elizabeth L. Hewins), p. 715.

Reference to *Davideis* in *The Man of Mode*, III. i. 53-56.

TIMES LITERARY SUPPLEMENT, October 20—

Gray's Imitation of Cowley (Paget Toynbee), p. 742.

—October 27—

More Payments to Chaucer (Edith Rickert), p. 766.

Harington's Epigrams (N. E. McClure), p. 767.

Date of composition.

